United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2018 No. 30

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 15, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

We thank You, O God, for giving us another day. Enlighten the hearts of those who are faithful and tireless in securing equal justice under the law. Fulfill the hopes of those who long for peace and security for their children. Guide and protect all elected officials and all who choose to serve this Nation and their local communities through public service.

May Your will be done in and through the Members of this people's House, those who trust in Your divine guidance and those, as well, who rely upon the gifts You have endowed them with. Even in the midst of conflicting opinions and philosophical differences, may they strive to come to mutually beneficial ends.

Unite Your people and keep them focused on the essentials that reflect Your kingdom. May the fire of divine love and human freedom renew the face of the Earth.

May all that is done today be for Your 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.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. SCHRADER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

RECOGNIZING HALEYVILLE, ALABAMA, AS THE BIRTHPLACE OF THE FIRST EVER 911 CALL

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my hometown and my home State of Haleyville, Alabama, as the birthplace of the first ever 911 phone call that was placed 50 years ago tomorrow, February 16, 1968.

This pioneering phone call remains a source of great pride in our city, in our State. The phone call was placed by Alabama's then-Speaker of the House, Rankin Fite; and my predecessor, Congressman Tom Bevill. The call was made on a bright red phone that has been showcased in our city hall for the last several years.

I am proud to report to my colleagues this morning that this red phone, a piece of Haleyville history, will be temporarily showcased as a piece of American history at the Smithsonian. The current mayor of Haleyville, Ken Sunseri, has done an outstanding job in marking this anniversary for our town; and, by the way, his father-in-law, James Whitt, was the mayor at the time the phone call was made.

I want to personally thank the mayor and so many others, including the National Emergency Number Association and all the 911 organizations, for all their efforts to recognize this 50th anniversary of the world's first 911 call.

PASS A DREAM ACT TO PROTECT DACA RECIPIENTS

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share Miriam's DACA

Printed on recycled paper.

story and continue to demand that House Republicans allow a vote on the Dream Act. Miriam was brought to Oregon by her parents when she was a little girl. She is grown and has not allowed her immigration status to deter her from working hard or pursuing her dreams.

When DACA was established in 2012, it opened a path that was unknown to her and has allowed her passion to flourish. Miriam is currently a sophomore in college, and her future is full of hope. She dreams of one day holding public office here at home and hopes to work towards a career in either public schools or as a computer engineer in the healthcare sector. This is a young lady who is working hard, doing the right things to better herself, and who maintains goals that give back to her community and this amazing country that raised her.

The sad reality is this Republican-controlled Congress and administration are holding Miriam's dreams hostage by not allowing a vote on the Dream Act. It is inhumane to continue to entangle the lives of these young folks in partisan games.

Let's do the right thing. Let's get a Dream Act passed so that our country can move forward and protect the 800,000 DACA recipients.

THANKING STENOGRAPHERS DURING NATIONAL COURT REPORTING AND CAPTIONING WEEK

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Court Reporting and Captioning Week.

As an attorney, from firsthand experience, I can say that court reporters have had and continue to have an enormous impact on our legal system, both in a practical matter but also in an important historical sense. As we attorneys talk away, court reporters tirelessly capture every single word. The importance of this cannot be underestimated. Without their record, there would be no Brown v. Board of Education, Miranda v. Arizona, or countless other legal decisions of importance to the American people.

Captioners also do wonderful work to help better the lives for millions of Americans who are deaf and hard of hearing by providing captioning realtime.

So, on National Court Reporting and Captioning Week, I want to thank the thousands of Americans who work in this industry for their hard work and dedication.

CONGRESS SHOULD REJECT THE DIRTY BUDGET AND INFRASTRUCTURE SCAM

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, as Americans, we have a responsibility to protect our environment and our public lands for today and for tomorrow, and that is why we, Congress, passed clean air and clean water laws. That is why we protected our public lands and treasured spaces.

President Trump has a different set of priorities. With his dirty budget and his infrastructure scam, President Trump is attacking basic environmental safeguards. The Trump budget cuts environmental protections and makes it impossible for the EPA to keep American families safe and healthy.

The Trump budget stops essential research on climate change, slashes clean energy development, and threatens endangered species. The Trump infrastructure scam repeals basic environmental safeguards and sells off our public lands to Big Oil. Once again, President Trump is putting polluters and their profits first at the expense of America's families being healthy.

Our air, water, and our land should never be partisan issues. Congress must reject this dirty budget and infrastructure scam and work to protect our environment and not destroy it.

RECOGNIZING PENNSBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR THEIR FOCUS ON MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Pennsbury School District in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for their focus on the mental health of their students and our community at large and their determination to end the drug epidemic. Pennsbury School District recently launched an onsite mental health counseling program for their high school students and their families in partnership with the district's new Addiction and Mental Health Task Force.

The clinical counseling, in partnership with St. Mary Medical Center and Family Service Association of Bucks County, began last month at the Pennsbury High School. The district hopes to continue its partnership and expand the program to students and families in the elementary and middle school communities.

As the co-chair of the Bipartisan Heroin Task Force, we have worked tirelessly, both in Congress and in our communities, to find solutions to this devastating epidemic. We are so encouraged by the steps that these members of our community are taking to address the issues of mental health and addiction.

We encourage every school district in Bucks County to follow the lead of Pennsbury School District in both educating and protecting our children, and we also thank the St. Mary Medical Center and Family Service Association of Bucks County for partnering with the Pennsbury School District in this critical program.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because, on a day when schoolchildren should be thinking about baseball tryouts, prom, and college selections, again they head to school living the reality that a gun may strike them down at any moment.

Today 17 children will never again return to their school in Florida, casualties in America's 18th shooting in 44 days. Once again parents and counselors will have to bring the comfort and security that this Congress refuses to offer.

This week in Chicago, a decorated police commander, Paul Bauer, was shot and killed, another officer lost in a disturbing trend of police shootings that we have not addressed either.

Mr. Speaker, Melissa Falkowski, a teacher in that school, asked when Congress will do something. A student said, The country needs to look in the mirror. He said, We cannot get used to this. This cannot become the norm.

Do you remember the terror you felt as grown men on that baseball field?

Well, imagine those young people in that school, in our neighborhoods, at a concert, in a park.

Despite your words, your prayers, you have proven over and over you don't care about anyone but yourselves and your contributions. It is sickening, and shame on you.

LOS HERNANDEZ TAMALES HONORED WITH JAMES BEARD FOUNDATION AWARD

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Los Hernandez Tamales in Union Gap, Washington, for winning the James Beard Foundation's 2018 America's Classics Award.

Felipe and June Hernandez, as well as their daughter and son-in-law, Rachel and Dion Wilburn, have operated the tamale eatery in the Yakima Valley for the last three decades. Felipe came to America from Mexico to work in agriculture and opened Los Hernandez Tamales in 1990. This family-owned establishment is well known for its pork, chicken, and seasonal asparagus tamales and, until now, remained a relatively secret spot among us locals.

The James Beard Foundation America's Classics Award honors locally owned restaurants that are cherished for quality food that reflects the character of their community, and Los Hernandez Tamales is the first restaurant in central Washington to be recognized by the foundation.

I, my family, my friends, and my staff can all attest that this award is well deserved, and it is an honor to recognize the Hernandezes for their hard work and accomplishments.

CELEBRATING PENN STATE'S THON

(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, tomorrow marks one of the finest traditions on Penn State's campus, a 46-hour dance marathon called THON. THON is the grand finale of a year-long fundraising campaign that Penn State students undertake for the kids. Beginning at 5 p.m. on Friday, more than 700 recognized dancers will put their stamina to the test and dance for 46 hours, without sleep, at the Bryce Jordan Center.

But it is much more than that. THON is the largest student-run philanthropy in the world, and it raises money to fight pediatric cancer. The proceeds raised go directly to Four Diamonds, which benefits the Penn State Children's Hospital in Hershey. Four Diamonds ensures that families who are battling pediatric cancer are not faced with any costs, allowing them to fully focus on the needs of their child. THON 2017 raised more than $10 million. Since its inception, THON has raised more than $146 million.

Mr. Speaker, I am always in awe of the power of our Penn State students and their care and concern for others. I wish everyone participating the best of luck.

We are.

ADA EDUCATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 620.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 736 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 620.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0914

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 620) to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to promote compliance through education, to clarify the requirements for demand letters, to provide for a notice and cure period before the commencement of a private civil action, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

□ 0915

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

Private enforcement of title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act is a critical tool for disabled individuals to gain access to places like restaurants and shopping centers. Most businessowners, however, feel blindsided when they are sued for violations they were unaware of.

This has been the case even for disabled businessowners who have testified before the House Judiciary Committee. Lee Ky testified in 2016. She runs one of her family's doughnut shops that was sued for technical violations of the ADA because a restroom sign was in the shape of a triangle instead of a square.

A person who has never walked in her life, Ky testified that she is proud of this Nation's effort to improve accessibility by enacting the ADA, but she thinks that businesses should be given an opportunity to remove barriers before getting sued.

Donna and David Batelaan have also testified. They were co-owners of a store that sold accessibility devices in Florida. Despite employing two people who used wheelchairs, despite themselves using wheelchairs, and despite the fact that virtually their entire clientele was composed of customers who had mobility limitations, they were sued because they had not painted lines and posted a sign for a ''handicapped'' spot required by the ADA.

Indeed, according to their testimony, it was later found that they had been just one of many businesses targeted by an unscrupulous, out-of-state attorney. According to Mrs. Batelaan, it did not matter that their parking lot and store were totally accessible. It was greed that was driving these suits.

These examples are among many shared by businesses across the country. The ADA's private right of action, which was originally intended to be the primary enforcement mechanism to achieve greater access, has instead encouraged a cottage industry of costly and wasteful litigation that neither benefits the business nor disabled individuals seeking more accessibility.

A report aired on ''60 Minutes'' on December 4, 2016, for example, featured several small-business owners who were subject to what are known as ''drive-by'' lawsuits. In such lawsuits, commonly filed by opportunistic trial lawyers, the plaintiff need only drive by the property, not actually visit it, to file a lawsuit alleging an ADA violation. In other cases, plaintiffs can even use Google Earth to target alleged violations and, in turn, file lawsuits before even notifying a small-business owner of the problem.

The fact that these types of small businesses are ill-equipped to defend an ADA lawsuit is the reason why they are sued. Indeed, opportunistic attorneys are more often willing to settle for just less than it would cost those mom-and-pop businesses to defend themselves in court. According to a 2017 op-ed published in The Hill, a conservative estimate of the average settlement amount is $7,500.

Given that plaintiff attorneys' motive is often to line their own pockets, there is little or no incentive to work with businesses to cure a violation before a lawsuit is filed. This results in wasted resources that could have been used to improve access.

H.R. 620 is a commonsense solution because it gives businesses a fair chance to cure title III violations before they are forced into a lawsuit, while still preserving the power of the threat of a lawsuit when businesses fail to make the required fixes in a timely manner.

H.R. 620 will create more access for more Americans more quickly because businesses would much rather fix an access problem quickly than face an unpredictable and expensive lawsuit that could hurt their ability to expand access in other ways.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense reform, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, before we discuss the bill before us today, I want to address the horrible school shooting in Florida yesterday.

We mourn the deaths of those shot and killed, and we support those who were injured and the families of the victims. But we must also do more to prevent future shootings in our schools and on our streets.

There have been 18 school shootings in this country so far this year, and it is only February. According to a Washington Post analysis, over the last 19 years, more than 150,000 students attending at least 170 primary and secondary schools have experienced a shooting on campus. That does not include violence outside of the classroom.

We cannot allow this to continue. It is long past due for the House to consider legislation on this floor to help prevent gun violence. Our calls for hearings and for action on gun violence prevention legislation have been met

with silence. Congress did nothing after Columbine 20 years ago, and nothing after Sandy Hook 5 years ago. Inaction is unacceptable. Moments of silence are completely inadequate. Our citizens demand that we act without delay.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 620, the so-called ADA Education and Reform Act of 2017, would undermine the civil rights of Americans with disabilities by significantly weakening the key enforcement tool of the ADA Act of 1990, which is the filing of private lawsuits by discrimination victims.

Congress passed the ADA 28 years ago with the goals of fully integrating persons with disabilities into the mainstream of American life and counteracting discriminatory social attitudes toward the disabled. By making it harder for persons facing such discrimination to vindicate their rights in court, this bill ultimately undermines those goals.

H.R. 620 would, among other things, institute a pre-suit notice and cure regime under the title III of the ADA, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in public accommodations, like hotels, restaurants, private schools, and healthcare providers.

Specifically, the bill would prohibit a disability discrimination victim from filing a lawsuit to enforce his or her rights under title III unless the victim first notifies a business of a title III violation. The victim must then wait up to 180 days to allow the business either to comply with the law or simply to make some undefined level of substantial progress—whatever that means—toward complying with the law.

No Federal civil rights statute imposes such onerous requirements on discrimination victims before they can have the opportunity to enforce their rights in court. Both individually and cumulatively, this bill's notice and cure provisions will have the effect of inappropriately shifting the burden of compliance with the Federal civil rights statute from the alleged wrongdoer onto the discrimination victim and perversely incentivizing businesses not to comply voluntarily with the ADA.

Moreover, because H.R. 620 does not define the term ''substantial progress,'' the bill leaves it entirely to a businessowner's discretion as to whether he has made such progress.

At a minimum, this raises the prospect of expensive and protracted litigation over the question of whether the business has made sufficiently substantial progress should a lawsuit be filed. Such a prospect, along with the need to wait 180 days before filing a lawsuit, may be enough to deter discrimination victims with meritorious claims from even sending a notice of violation, much less filing suit to enforce their rights.

In addition, the bill's notice requirement is overly burdensome and excessive. Rather than simply requiring an aggrieved person to notify a business of the existence of an access barrier, H.R. 620 essentially requires the person to plead a legal case in his or her initial notice.

For instance, a victim must cite the specific provision of the ADA that has been violated, describe whether the victim made a request to the business about removing an access barrier, and explain whether an access barrier was temporary or permanent. Such specific information may be very difficult or impossible for a discrimination victim to provide at the notice stage, particularly without legal counsel.

Finally, H.R. 620 does not even address the purported problem identified by his proponents who claim that a pre-suit notification is needed to stop lawyers from filing numerous similar lawsuits alleging both Federal ADA claims and State law claims against numerous businesses in order to force quick settlements.

That is because many States allow for damages under their State disability rights laws. But this ignores the fact that title III of the Federal ADA only permits recovery of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, no recovery of money damages. In other words, it is State law, not the Federal ADA, which provides the financial incentive for pursuing numerous lawsuits.

Additionally, the filing of multiple suits alleging violations of the ADA or State disability laws says nothing about the underlying merits of those suits or the intent of the parties involved.

To the extent that lawyers actually engage in misconduct, courts already have the tools to address such misconduct, including imposing sanctions, refusing to award attorneys' fees, or dismissing cases that have no legal or factual basis.

A pre-suit notification requirement, together with a lack of any requirement to actually comply with the law, is a virtual get-out-of-jail-free card for every public accommodation in America.

H.R. 620 substantially diminishes the primary incentive for voluntary compliance with title III, which is the credible risk of being sued and having to pay reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

H.R. 620's notice and cure requirements, by starkly diminishing the risk of litigation, would send a clear and devastating message to every public accommodation in America that there is no need to comply voluntarily with the ADA. Instead, the bill tells businesses that they should simply wait and see if they ever receive a notice of a violation and to forget about the rights and needs of people with disabilities until then.

As the former Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge wrote recently in The Hill in opposing H.R. 620: ''. . . it is unacceptable to roll back the civil rights of people with disabilities. We should ensure access, not progress. We should expect businesses to know and comply with their obligations, not require our neighbors and colleagues with disabilities to shoulder the burden of informing and educating businesses about those obligations. We should not turn the business of everyday life into a complex and legal ordeal for people with disabilities.''

For the foregoing reasons, I oppose H.R. 620 and I urge the House to reject this deeply flawed bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the gentleman from New York.

In point of fact, the United States Code contains several examples in which a potential plaintiff must provide notice before filing a lawsuit.

For example, title I of the ADA, in fact, requires a plaintiff to first file an administrative complaint with the EEOC. Unlike a complaint filed in Federal court, it is a method for parties to try to resolve the case before litigation through a conciliation process. As part of this process, the complainant is required to fill out a form that puts the recipient on notice of the alleged issues. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act has a similar process.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the goal of the American with Disabilities Act is to provide access for the disabled. That goal must be pursued and protected.

It is important to distinguish, however, that the ADA is not intended to feed drive-by lawsuits and put good people out of business.

Unfortunately, my State of California has become ground zero for abusive ADA lawsuits. I have heard from many small businesses in my congressional district that have fallen victim to abusive ADA lawsuits that are not aimed at improving access to the disabled. In fact, California accounts for roughly 40 percent of ADA lawsuits nationwide, despite being home to just 12 percent of the country's disabled population.

Protecting small businesses from abusive lawsuits and ensuring disabled Americans have adequate access are not mutually exclusive goals. That is why I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 620 and believe its passage is critical to both the disabled and to our small businesses. By giving businessowners adequate time to make appropriate changes to provide access, we are returning to the original spirit and intent of the ADA.

I thank my friend from Texas, Representative POE, for his leadership on this issue, as well as the bipartisan group of cosponsors for their support. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill and ensure that serial litigants are no longer rewarded for taking advantage of an important and meaningful law.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend, the ranking member, Mr. NADLER, for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Many of my colleagues may not remember when the Civil Rights Act became the law of the land in 1964, but I remember. I was there. As a matter of fact, I gave a little blood during the sit-ins, during the Freedom Rides.

□ 0930

I remember the struggle, the fight, and the sacrifice of so many to protect the dignity and the worth of every human being. I was here serving in this very Chamber when the Americans with Disabilities Act became the law of the land 26 years later. Yet today, it is unbelievable; it is unreal; we are considering a bill that turns the clock backwards and strikes a devastating blow in the fight for civil rights.

Mr. Chair, I want to make it crystal clear for the record: there is no place in our country for the burden to be placed on those whose rights have and will be violated time and time again.

Mr. Chair, this bill is wrong, it is mean-spirited, and it is a shame and a disgrace that we would bring it to the floor. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairman for his long work on this issue, and I want to thank a couple of the cosponsors—this is a bipartisan bill—Congressman PETERS, Congresswoman SPEIER, and Mr. KEN CALVERT, who have worked on this for years. I appreciate the words of the gentleman who just spoke, a great leader in civil rights movement, but as he probably knows, title VII of the Civil Rights Act does require notice, as well as this legislation hopefully will do.

And let me be clear. This legislation makes the ADA better because it requires that businesses be told and be given a chance to fix the problem if there is a problem.

Under current law, that is not the case. The goal of this bill, the ADA legislation that we have, is to have accommodations for the disabled and to make sure businesses comply with that accommodation.

When a lawsuit is filed, many times the business is never told what the problem is, and it may be a year or longer before that lawsuit ends up in a Federal court. Under this legislation, businesses, once they are put on notice, they have 180 days to fix the problem or make substantial progress.

If the goal of the ADA is to get problems fixed, the legislation we have here helps that. But what is taking place in our country, Mr. Chair, because of the legislation that we currently have under the law, some lawyers, as mentioned earlier, use the legislation and abuse the legislation under current ADA to the disadvantage of the disabled to make a profit for themselves.

And here is the way it works, Mr. Chair. A litigant, a plaintiff, will send a letter or sometimes file a lawsuit against a small business. We are not talking about the big businesses—we are talking about small mom-and-pop stores—and telling them they have an ADA violation. The letter—the lawsuit—may not even state what the violation is. And the letter says: ''You pay or we will continue the lawsuit.''

These businesses don't have the money to hire a lawyer to represent them, so what do they do? They pay the $3,000, $5,000, the extortion, so that those lawsuits are dismissed.

The problem that may be alleged in that lawsuit is never required to be fixed for two reasons: one, the lawsuit doesn't require it; and second, these lawsuits may not state what the problem is.

So, if the goal of the ADA is to make businesses comply, these serial plaintiffs that are filing multiple lawsuits still don't require that the businesses, even if they get the money, have to comply with the alleged violation. This is happening throughout the United States.

Let me mention just a few of these. In Florida, a plaintiff named Howard Cohan filed 529 of these lawsuits; California, a person named Vogel filed 124; Pennsylvania, a plaintiff named Mielo brought 21 lawsuits; and even in New York, a plaintiff named Hirsch brought 24 lawsuits.

What are they doing?

These plaintiffs may not even live in the State where the violation is supposed to occur. These plaintiffs may not even be disabled themselves, but they will file the lawsuit against these businesses, sometimes using Google Maps to find a violation in the parking lot, send a letter from a law firm saying, ''You comply with paying us, or this lawsuit''—or paying us this shakedown is what it amounts to—''or we will continue the lawsuit,'' and many businesses file or pay the extortion. It has become a profit industry.

It doesn't help the disabled. Contrary to what the other side has said, these lawsuits do not help the disabled. In fact, I think these lawsuits are being filed on behalf of serial plaintiffs who want nothing else except to receive extortion money.

Before my time is completed, I want to mention some of the Federal judges. One Federal judge from New York has taken notice of these cases.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, Federal judges have said that there are issues with these drive-by lawsuits.

Judge Brian Cogan of the Eastern District of New York, in 2016, in his decision, said that these cases, ''are brought against small bars and grills, restaurants, or bodegas or occasionally corner grocery stores (and sometimes their landlords), which are likely ill-equipped financially to vigorously defend these violations, and it is to intimidate businesses to settle before the trial takes place.''

I have parents that are in their 90s. I am concerned about access for all disabled people, and the thought that this bill makes it worse for the disabled is wrong. This bill makes businesses comply and puts them on notice. If they don't comply within the time period, then file the lawsuit, go after them, but businesses should be able to have the notice of what the problem is so that they can fix it, which is the goal of the ADA: to make businesses comply.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

H.R. 620, the so-called ADA Education and Reform Act of 2017, is an attack on the civil rights of Americans with disabilities. The Americans with Disabilities Act, or the ADA, is a civil rights law passed in 1990 to protect people with disabilities from discrimination in all aspects of society.

I recognize that the ADA falls within the committee jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, and I am here as the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce because, if H.R. 620 were to become law, it would have a profound effect on students and workers with disabilities who are trying to learn, work, or just generally access their community.

Mr. Chair, prior to the ADA, people with disabilities had no recourse if they faced discrimination in employment, housing, transportation, health services, or when accessing public schools. The ADA is nearly 28 years old, and yet we still have continued gross noncompliance with the law.

H.R. 620 specifically targets title III of the ADA regarding access to public accommodations. Title III prohibits discrimination in public accommodations such as restaurants, shopping malls, and hotels. By adding a notice and cure requirement, H.R. 620 shifts the compliance burden to the victims of discrimination.

H.R. 620 effectively provides that discrimination against people with disabilities can continue until somebody hires a lawyer to file a legal complaint of discrimination. Then the bill allows 6 more months to achieve some undefined substantial progress. So even when people know they are out of compliance with the ADA, they don't have to do anything under the bill until somebody files a formal legal complaint.

Mr. Chair, this bill does not help people with disabilities. This is an attack

on civil rights. That is why the disability community and civil rights communities are unanimously opposed to H.R. 620.

There are 236 organizations that joined a letter, led by the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, opposing the bill. More than 500 national and State organizations signed a letter, led by the National Council on Independent Living, urging Congress to reject the bill. More than 200 organizations signed a letter, led by The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, urging Congress to reject the bill.

The ADA was enacted to eliminate barriers of discrimination against people with disabilities. And so I strongly urge each of my colleagues to stand with people with disabilities: protect civil rights by voting ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), the primary cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for yielding.

One thing I want to agree with Mr. NADLER on is his comments about the tragedy yesterday in Florida. I completely endorse those comments with respect to that tragic event.

I do rise today in support of H.R. 620, the ADA Education and Reform Act. Today, as Members have heard, the ADA is being abused by a few bad actors who are serving their own personal interest, financial interest, not fighting for the disabled. They file lawsuits and immediately settle them for a few thousand dollars without actually requiring that anything be fixed. Nobody says this abuse is not happening. Nobody says this advances the cause of access.

A small restaurant owner in downtown San Diego tells a typical story. It was sued by an attorney who had filed 50 ADA suits against restaurants in San Diego County in 1 year. The barriers claimed in that suit didn't exist. The tables were at ADA compliant height, the bathroom was accessible, there was access between tables, but the property owner's attorney told him it could cost him upwards of $50,000 to prove it in court, so they settled with the plaintiff for $2,500.

The serial litigant got the quick payoff he wanted although there were no violations that had to be fixed, and if there were violations, it wouldn't have required that they be fixed. We hear stories all the time of lawsuits settled without any barriers being fixed.

Now, some State governments have acted to curb this abuse. And do you know who has led the fight against the abuse of disability laws? California Democrats.

In 2016, Governor Jerry Brown signed S. 269, authored by a Democratic State senator and passed by a majority Democratic legislature. It gives businesses 120 days to correct violations claimed by a plaintiff. It is a bipartisan solution that educates businessowners on compliance, redirects payouts to settle claims away from lawyers and toward actually improving access, and it protects against these cookie-cutter lawsuits filed by serial plaintiffs.

Now, let me address some of the issues that have been raised today. We are trying to provide the same kind of correction at the Federal level.

First, this bill doesn't turn anyone into a second-class citizen by requiring notice and an opportunity to cure. The concept of notice and cure is not new to private rights of action. In fact, it is very common.

Under the Clean Water Act in which I practice, if a complainant has to notify violators of a violation, the violator has 60 days to fix the problem before he can file a private right of action.

And in civil rights laws, too, as has been said, notice and opportunity to cure is common. Before you can file a lawsuit for a hostile workplace environment, for instance, you have to file a claim and give the employer the chance to fix it.

And the same is true, quite ironically, for disability. If you want to file a notice on reasonable accommodation, you have to give the opportunity to fix it. Today, we are asking that businessowners be given the same chance to fix problems that we currently give employers.

Second, the bill does not hold harmless public accommodations. Under H.R. 620, public accommodations are still responsible for ensuring access under threat of litigation. If a property owner fails timely and adequately to respond to a notice, she is subject to the same remedies that exist today.

Third, a notice and cure period does not shift the burden of compliance from businesses to victims. Today, if a public accommodation is out of compliance with the ADA, a plaintiff—a real plaintiff who had a problem with it—would have to file a lawsuit to force compliance. Under H.R. 620, a plaintiff would be able to file a notice that starts the timeline to fix the problems that exist. That doesn't shift the burden.

And finally, H.R. 620 does not weaken the rights of the disabled. On the contrary, it facilitates the removal of barriers to ensure better access for the disabled within a short period of time, discouraging the quick payoffs that do nothing for access.

□ 0945

No one solution proposed by Congress is ever perfect. I have worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find amendments and changes to the law to make the timeline for fixes tighter and to tighten the definitions of compliance. In fact, many of the defects that are noticed by Mr. NADLER, I believe, will be addressed by amendments today.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Specifically, we will have a provision for plain language notice, which I think is an improvement: 120-day clarification instead of 180 days, and a better definition of what substantial progress means.

I think we can continue to improve the bill, and I hope to work with my colleagues and the Senate to do that. But in the face of undisputed abuse of one of our Nation's civil rights laws for personal gain, I am certain that doing nothing is the worst response.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, because we are talking about need this morning, having seen Mr. DEUTCH in Florida, let me offer my deepest sympathy for the tragic loss of our children.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to be able to speak for many of those who cannot be on the floor today, and that is the millions of disabled Americans; and to be able to say that with all of the consternation and the uncomfortableness of some of the very important people in America: small businesses, the engine of our economy.

I have to stand and speak for the value of civil rights and the civil rights of Americans with disabilities who waited for centuries to not be looked upon in distaste and disgust.

I remember preceding the passage of the American with Disabilities Act. George H.W. Bush is a Texan, and I see often his passion for passing that bill.

There are 57 million Americans with disabilities. That translates to 1 in 5 Americans. There are 31 million Americans with physical disabilities.

I heard some of their comments: ''As an older woman with disabilities, I feel invisible.'' Or ''I am not living; I am just existing.''

The ''notice and cure'' framework included in this bill would fundamentally change the structure of the ADA's public accommodations title and remove any reasons for business to comply proactively with the law.

The same as the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that we now suffer because we gutted section 4 and section 5, and we have voter suppression, and people are not having their civil rights in terms of voting.

You touch this in a way that you undermine the very existence of people living with disabilities. I am outraged, even though I am empathetic.

But if it is a problem of lawyers, State bars can regulate them and State courts can regulate them. You can punish or sanction lawyers who do not have the proper protocols.

Mr. Chairman, this is wrongheaded. I ask my colleagues to stand for civil rights for Americans with disabilities. This is not just an amendment. It is undermining the civil rights of those

who are living with disabilities. They have a right to live.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 620, the ''ADA Education and Reform Act,'' legislation that would infringe on important civil rights of Americans who live with physical disabilities.

I am deeply troubled that the House of Representatives is taking up H.R. 620, legislation that would remove any incentive businesses currently have to comply with this longstanding civil rights law and undermining protections that allow millions to live independently and in the dignified manner they deserve.

There are about 57 million Americans with disabilities; that number translates to 1 in 5 Americans.

There are 31 million Americans with physical disabilities who use a wheelchair, cane, crutches, or a walker.

And for that I commend former President George H. W. Bush, along with many members of Congress, for their leadership in passing the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, legislation that made our country's public spaces more accessible to those with disabilities.

H.R. 620 would require disabled persons to notify businesses of a violation of the ADA's public accommodation provisions contained in title III of the act, and wait up to 180 days to remedy that alleged violation before a lawsuit could be filed, presenting a direct undermining of the civil rights of Americans with disabilities.

The ''notice and cure'' framework included in this bill would fundamentally change the structure of the ADA's public accommodations title and remove any reasons for business to comply proactively with the law.

H.R. 620's notice and cure provisions will have the effect of inappropriately shifting the burden of enforcing compliance with a federal civil rights statute from the alleged wrongdoer onto the discrimination victim.

Moreover, it would undermine the carefully calibrated voluntary compliance regime that is one of the hallmarks of the ADA, a regime formed through negotiations between the disability rights community and the business community when the ADA was being drafted 28 years ago.

H.R. 620 would, instead, perversely incentivize a public accommodation to not comply with the ADA unless and until it receives a notice of a violation pursuant to H.R. 620's notice provision.

Finally, the bill does nothing to address the problem that its proponents seek to address, which is the purported concern with the filing of meritless lawsuits by certain plaintiffs' attorneys, a problem (to the extent that it is actually a problem) that is one of state law, not the federal ADA.

This is not the first time in this Congress, or even this year, that I witness the Republicans, allegedly a party for state's rights, completely undermine the established idea that tort law should be left for states to legislate without interference from federal mandates.

H.R. 620's proponents have never adequately articulated why federal law must be amended to address a problem driven by state law.

Also, the bill makes no attempt to distinguish between meritorious and non-meritorious lawsuits and would, instead, impose its harmful and unnecessary requirements on all ADA claims, regardless of potential merit.

I remain adamantly opposed to any effort to weaken the ability of individuals to enforce their rights under federal civil rights laws and I am concerned that H.R. 620 would undermine the key enforcement mechanism of the ADA and other civil rights laws, namely, the ability to file private lawsuits to enforce rights.

Joining me and my colleagues in opposition is a broad coalition of 236 disability rights groups, including:

American Foundation for the Blind,
the Bazelon Center for Mental Health,
the Christopher and Dana Reeve Foundation,
the National Council on Independent Living,
the National Disability Rights Network,
the Paralyzed Veterans of America,
Vietnam Veterans of America,
the AFL–CIO,
the Anti-Defamation League,
Human Rights Campaign,
the NAACP, and
the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

Additionally, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights opposes the bill because it would ''remove incentives for businesses to comply with the law unless and until people with disabilities are denied access'' which ''would lead to the continued exclusion of people with disabilities from the mainstream of society and would turn back the clock on disability rights in America.''

Likewise, the American Civil Liberties Union opposes H.R. 620 because it would ''fundamentally alter [the] way in which a person with a disability enforces their civil rights and would severely limit access to places of public accommodations.''

For the foregoing reasons and those discussed below, we strongly oppose H.R. 620 and respectfully dissent from the Committee report.

While it is very important to protect small and growing businesses, we can do so without jeopardizing the rights of disabled individuals to have a day in court.

I do not believe that we have crossed the T's and dotted the I's with all the information that we should have in trying to improve our situation and address the concerns of many small businesses.

Small businesses are the heartbeat of America and the backbone of successful communities, which is why I have served as one of their strongest advocates during my tenure in Congress.

But the reality is that H.R. 620 does not help small businesses, it only hurts the disabled.

I do, however, hope that we can achieve this balanced goal through a different avenue.

So today I stand with Ranking Member NADLER, Congressman LANGEVIN and all those who stand for civil rights and for the rights of Americans with disabilities.

For these reasons I oppose H.R. 620.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes to respond to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Opponents of this bill claim it will delay access in some cases, even if just by a few months. But under current law, unscrupulous lawyers already delay filing ADA complaints for months after alleged violations are discovered, simply to boost their claim for attorneys' fees based on hours worked.

Here is an affidavit from a former ADA lawyer showing his firm fraudulently and routinely waited months to alert businessowners of potential violations and file lawsuits so they could falsely claim many hours of work preparing the case when no such work was required. Here is what the lawyer testified to:

> The alleged time entries at issue in this case include authorizing discovery 6 months in advance of the case being filed. I told Mr. Lopez, the real person in charge, this practice was useless. Mr. Lopez's response was that increasing legal fees was what I was supposed to do.

This means that, today, there are months of unnecessary delays before the businessowner is even notified of a violation so they can begin working on fixing the problem. That is an additional delay of months that this bill will eliminate.

The bottom line is that, in ADA cases, lawyers routinely delay filing lawsuits to boost their fees. This bill will stop that practice and let that time and money be used instead to increase access, not pad the pockets of unethical lawyers.

This bill will provide access months sooner than under current law. This is a pro-civil rights bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, first of all, the American Bar Association supports this legislation.

Secondarily, the gentleman is talking about lawyers, not the disabled. Let the State bars and let the State courts regulate these lawyers. Sanction them, just like we have sanctions in the Federal court system.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, they oppose our bill to increase sanctions on unethical lawyers.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, one of our great Republican Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, who served in this body, spoke of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

We didn't start out that way, but through civil rights movements and civil rights statutes, we have opened America up. The Americans with Disabilities Act has been a crucial piece of legislation to opening America up—our restaurants, our hotels, all of our business establishments—to tens of millions of Americans who otherwise couldn't fully participate fully and on an equal basis.

This bill would require a totally novel requirement in the civil rights field, that in order to sue for violations of public accommodations law under the ADA, the person must first notify the business of their alleged violations and then wait 180 days to allow the business to remedy the violation, or make substantial progress towards compliance. No other Federal civil rights law operates this way. They just don't work like that. The ADA has been in process for 27 years, and there is no reason that any business today should be out of compliance with a very clear directive under the ADA.

The new notice and cure provisions will have the effect of shifting the burden of enforcement from the wrongdoer to the victim of discrimination. It would incentivize businesses not to comply with the ADA, unless it receives a notice of violation.

Now, our colleagues raised questions of overzealous, or vexatious, or abusive litigation by certain lawyers, and we know that there are cases of that. They are in the handful of States that have added damages under the ADA.

Understand that, under the ADA, federally, there are no damages. You can just get your costs and your legal fees. So some States have added damages.

Then there are some lawyers who are out making trouble. We agree with that. Use the State bars to sanction them. If there is sanctionable behavior, disbar them. Deal with that problem. But don't cut the heart out of the Americans with Disabilities Act, which has been central to the ability of our people and all of our families to participate on an equal basis in our economy and in our society.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland just said that, after decades, the ADA was well understood and the law was easy to comply with. In many cases, that may be true, but technology has been advancing so quickly that there are areas where the ADA is not clear today, and we are in need of guidance.

Mr. Chairman, in the great State of Georgia, scores of businesses have received demand letters for their websites, that their websites should be considered public accommodations; and demand letters to say those websites do not comply with the ADA, when these businesses do not know how to make their websites comply with the ADA.

Fifty credit unions alone, Mr. Chairman—folks who are in the business of serving our communities—have received these demand letters, unable to respond.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), if he would be willing, and ask if he is aware of the issues created by this emergence of technology and the predatory litigation that credit unions, community banks, and other small mom-and-pop businesses are facing.

Mr. POE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Yes, the gentleman from Georgia is absolutely correct, I am aware of this matter.

Also, I am aware that the gentleman joined Chairman GOODLATTE and about 60 Members of this Chamber last year to urge the Justice Department to finalize a regulation in this area with the intent of providing certainty. Even still, it is not clear that there is a statutory obligation under the ADA for the Department of Justice to act, which is why H.R. 620 doesn't address that issue specifically.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his guidance.

Of course, there was no opportunity for the ADA to anticipate the internet, to anticipate websites. So it is unclear whether or not Congress intended for websites to fall inside the public accommodations statute.

Because of this ambiguity, though, all of the small businesses—everyone with a website presence, Mr. Chairman—are unclear about whether or not they are violating the law. They don't even have a framework of guidance so that they could comply with the laws that I know each and every one of these credit unions, community banks, and small businesses wants to do.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) if he would be willing to commit to working with me to encourage the Justice Department to move forward with some guidance in this area so that we could provide certainty not just to credit unions and not just to community banks, but to all of these small businesses looking to do their very best to comply with the ADA?

Mr. POE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman is aware, this legislation makes it better for the disabled to have access under the notice and cure requirement.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. The Judiciary Committee will continue to work with the Department of Justice and stakeholders on this. In fact, for jurisdictions where courts have held the ADA does apply to websites, we believe protections in H.R. 620 will be applicable as well.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, these are small businesses that want to do their very best to comply with the ADA. With guidance, they will be successful in that effort.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, Mr. NADLER, for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, as a former Delaware Secretary of Labor, I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 620, the ADA Education and Reform Act of 2017. This bill on the floor today would roll back the clock on civil rights for people with disabilities.

Twenty-seven years ago, Congress passed the transformative Americans with Disabilities Act, which prohibited discrimination against people with disabilities and mandated that they have an equal opportunity to participate in society. Before the ADA, a person with a disability could be barred from a meaningful career, education, and, really, to live a fulfilling life.

Mr. Chairman, some claim that the ADA exposes businesses to exorbitant costs or damage awards, but this is not the norm. It is one of the myths that has perpetuated. According to the Department of Labor, 57 percent of accommodations cost nothing at all, while the rest typically cost only $500.

So once you peel back the myths surrounding the ADA, we are left with one simple question: Why not comply?

The monetary cost is typically minimal in comparison to the value of providing qualified Americans with a job or a shot at the American Dream; or giving an individual with a disability the means to go to the grocery store, pick up their children from childcare, or travel, or work.

That is why these standards are so essential. They ensure real, fair, and equal access for everyone.

People with disabilities simply want to live an independent life, free from discrimination. This bill rolls back that progress.

I will be voting against this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

□ 1000

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 620, which would violate the 28-year-old Americans with Disabilities Act by allowing public places to bar access to people with disabilities. H.R. 620 would actually allow barriers for the disabled to stay in place as long as ''substantial progress'' is made to remove them, whatever that means.

The ADA was a compromise, giving the disability community access and helping businesses to comply by giving them tax credits and training. H.R. 620 undoes that compromise, making it virtually impossible to enforce the

ADA's goal of fairness and inclusion; and that is why the AARP, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the National Council on Independent Living, and the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities oppose this bill.

It is why the National Organization of Nurses with Disabilities ''believes that H.R. 620 represents a downward spiral of the Americans With Disabilities Act and will impact people with disabilities' freedom of access . . . across the United States.''

And it is why 55 Illinois—where I am from—disability groups, led by Access Living, whose president, Marca Bristo, my personal hero, helped enact the Americans with Disabilities Act, she says and they say: ''H.R. 620 . . . would fundamentally harm our Nation's progress toward an accessible and integrated society. The bill telegraphs to individuals with disabilities that . . . their inclusion is not important.''

Let's show people with disabilities that they do matter, that they shouldn't be locked out of restaurants or sporting events or job opportunities, that they should not be treated as second-class citizens in the American civil justice system. Show your commitment to the ADA and to civil rights, and vote ''no.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the affidavit that I cited in my earlier remarks.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Case No. 1:17–cv–24116–KMM

Enrique Madrinan, Plaintiff, v. Harbour Shopping Center, Inc. and Luza Corp. d/b/a Donut Gallery Diner, Defendants.

DEFENDANT LUZA CORP.'S NOTICE OF FILING AFFIDAVIT IN RELATION TO DOCKET ENTRY THIRTY-THREE, PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO DEFENDANTS RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISQUALIFY COUNSEL AND LAW FIRM REPRESENTING DEFENDANT LUZA CORP., D/B/A DONUT GALLERY DINER

7. Notably, the alleged time entries at issue in this case, include authoring discovery six months in advance of the case being filed. Because most cases settled upon filing, and Federal Disability Advocates wanted to bill hours before they settled, they had their off-site team who handled the pre-filing, filing, and service, serve discovery with the Complaint. I repetitively told Mr. Lopez, the real person in charge of Federal Disability Advocates, this practice was useless because a party cannot propound discovery until after the scheduling conference. I even argued that it was counter-productive because it led to a debate over when, and if, discovery was served, which unnecessarily increased legal fees. Mr. Lopez's response was that increasing legal fees was what I was supposed to do, and that serving discovery with the complaint was part of how to get to ten hours pre-filing.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip and one of the original authors of the ADA in 1990.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation.

In 1990, President George H.W. Bush declared a long overdue ''independence day'' for people with disabilities as he signed the historic Americans with Disabilities Act into law. As the House sponsor of the ADA, I shared the President's optimism and hope that every man, woman, and child with a disability can now pass through once-closed doors into a bright new era of equality, independence, and freedom.

I was proud to work across the aisle on the ADA and on the ADA Amendments Act of 2008, the only time the ADA has ever been amended. We brought together outside groups from a broad range of affiliations to create a framework for policy that would vastly improve accessibility and be agreeable to all.

Unfortunately, people with disabilities still face stubborn barriers to full inclusion. In the last year, people with differing abilities have had to fight for access to healthcare and the services they need to live independently and with dignity.

Now we have on the floor a bill that would undermine the central tenet of the ADA: the right of victims of discrimination to seek redress for exclusion. Requiring victims of discrimination to provide notice of a violation before bringing a lawsuit is an improper shift of the burden of compliance onto victims, one not required of any other group by any other civil rights law. Not a single civil rights law gives this kind of provision.

As the Paralyzed Veterans of America wrote in its letter of opposition: ''Veterans with disabilities who honorably served their country should not bear the burden of ensuring that businesses in their communities are meeting their ADA obligations. Instead, it is the responsibility of businessowners and their associations to educate themselves about the law's requirements.''

Now, this law was passed some 27 years ago. There is no excuse for not knowing the obligations. Our laws do not require such notice for women, African Americans, Latinos, religious minorities, or any other groups protected against discrimination.

I acknowledge that there are issues in States that have added compensatory damages to their State laws. There are no damages in this national ADA law, which was a compromise. A problem with State law, however, should be fixed at the State level and not with a retreat in the Federal law. Lawyers who file vexatious suits may well be in violation of their ethical obligations.

Sadly, we are seeing that almost 28 years after its passage and decades of notice as to what is required, tax credits so that you can make changes necessary to make your place accessible, there are still those who have barriers to full accommodation for Americans with differing abilities, contrary to law. In fact, when we adopted the law, we didn't have it go into effect for 24 months—2 years—so that people could educate themselves on their responsibilities.

People with differing abilities still have to fight day in and day out for the access and inclusion to which they should already be entitled under the law as businesses continue to dismiss their obligations.

We have a colleague, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH. She was a helicopter pilot. Her legs were shot off. She now serves in the United States Senate. She is a disabled veteran and an American hero. She wrote the following in The Washington Post about this bill: ''This offensive legislation would segregate the disability community, making it the only protected class under civil rights law that must rely on 'education'—rather than strong enforcement—to guarantee access to public spaces.''

I will be voting ''no'' on this legislation in the name of upholding the bedrock principles of civil rights law in this country and the integrity of the ADA that many of us worked together to enact on a bipartisan basis, an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis, 400 votes-plus, for this legislation. Let us not retreat this day. Let us not say to those with disabilities: You have got to wait 180 days.

What if we said: If you are an African American and you try to go into a place of public accommodations and they wouldn't admit you, and you said, ''Well, I have got a complaint,'' and you had to wait 180 days to have that right redressed, that is not right.

Let us not treat those with disabilities as second-rate citizens. Defeat this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman from Maryland.

The technical requirements of title III are constantly changing. We have seen numerous revisions to both regulations and guidance, not to mention the resulting case law that affects its interpretation; therefore, the regulatory requirements of the ADA in 1991 are not the same as those today.

There is no better example of these changes than the rise of the internet, which came into its current existence after the ADA was enacted. As people no longer need a physical storefront to have a business, the courts have struggled to apply the ADA's public accommodation requirements.

There is, for example, a current circuit split as to whether companies operating exclusively online are subject to these requirements. And with continued advancements in technology, we will continue to see changes to the regulatory requirements.

It is perfectly reasonable for small-business owners, many of whom are disabled themselves or of minorities, to have the opportunity to fix a problem before a predatory lawyer simply brings an action for the purpose of recovering—not fixing the problem, but getting money that could have been better spent by that small business fixing the problem.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, 28 years after the ADA's passage, too many businesses remain inaccessible to persons with disabilities. The last thing Congress should be doing is undermining the civil rights of a discrete and insular minority group by making it virtually impossible to enforce their rights in court.

That is why more than 230 disability rights groups, civil rights groups, labor unions, and veterans organizations strongly oppose H.R. 620, including the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the AARP, the NAACP, Human Rights Campaign, the AFL–CIO, AFSCME, the Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the United Spinal Association, the National Federation of the Blind, and the National Disability Rights Network. I urge the House to abide by these groups' concerns with H.R. 620 and reject this deeply problematic legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have no speakers remaining other than myself and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 620, the ADA Education and Reform Act. This misguided piece of legislation is being sold to my colleagues and the American public as a measure that will help people with disabilities, help businesses come into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and help reduce drive-by lawsuits in States that have gone beyond the ADA to allow for monetary awards. In actuality, H.R. 620 doesn't accomplish any of these objectives.

What is worse, if passed, this ill-considered bill will not only decimate the protections that people with disabilities rely on, it will turn back the clock to a more segregated society, and it will unravel the core promise of the ADA that a disability, visible or otherwise, can never be grounds to justify or tolerate discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, I am angry. I am frustrated. I am insulted. But more than anything, I am disappointed. Further, neither Mr. PETERS nor Mr. POE ever even approached me to sit down and have a discussion about this bill, to try to find some common ground to try to actually fix the problem if it is about drive-by lawsuits.

Has the Congress really become so divorced from the human experience of the disability community that we are willing to sacrifice their rights because it is easier than targeting the root of the problem? Are people with disabilities, people like me, so easily disregarded?

I am here to say enough is enough.

Mr. Chairman, whether someone is born with a disability, develops a disability, or becomes disabled due to an accident or from having served in our Armed Forces, the fundamental truth is that it happened by chance, certainly not by choice.

As the first quadriplegic elected to the United States Congress, I overcame many obstacles to sit beside you as a Member of this Chamber, but I would never have had the opportunities that I cherish today without the tireless efforts of those who came before me to fight for the rights of people with disabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I was injured in 1980, at just 16 years of age, a full 10 years before the passage of the ADA, and I certainly remember what life was like before the ADA became law. I remember that I couldn't go inside a public building that didn't have a ramp, couldn't travel without accessible transportation, and was excluded from gatherings in restaurants and libraries, movie theaters and sports venues that couldn't accommodate a wheelchair.

I struggled to wash my hands at a sink, access a restroom, and enter a classroom. I even declined matriculation at my first-choice college because the challenge of getting around the campus would have been too difficult, if not impossible.

Mr. Chairman, the ADA brought more than just the recognition that disability rights are civil rights. It brought hope and opportunity to millions of people, and it brought dignity.

□ 1015

Mr. Chairman, after all, having a disability should not limit opportunity, and it is with opportunity that people with disabilities can lead more active, productive, and independent lives.

The ADA was passed nearly 28 years ago, and instead of holding people accountable to correctly implement the law, especially when free resources and technical information are readily available, H.R. 620 weakens Federal protections under the ADA, protections that prohibit discrimination on the basis of a disability.

The ADA does not allow people to sue for compensatory or punitive damages, only injunctive relief. Yet some States have gone beyond the Federal law to permit monetary awards.

H.R. 620 seeks to address the issue by including a notice and cure period.

Well, the idea that places of public accommodation should receive a free pass for 6 months before correctly implementing a law that has been a part of our legal framework for nearly three decades creates an obvious disincentive for ADA compliance.

People with disabilities, Mr. Chairman, still face immeasurable obstacles, despite the progress of our great Nation since the passage of the ADA.

This past year, the disability community has had to fight to preserve access to healthcare, the long-term services and supports that are a lifeline for so many under Medicaid, and the ability to maintain certain protections and credits under the Tax Code.

Mr. Chairman, they are tired, and I am tired, of defending against efforts to weaken our rights. I urge my colleagues to see past the smoke and mirrors and irresponsible claims that H.R. 620 is anything but an appalling effort to strip away the civil rights of a protected class of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, every vote in support of H.R. 620 will be a message to people with disabilities that we are not worthy of inclusion, acceptance, or deserve the same civil rights protections as others.

Mr. Chairman, as Members of Congress, Americans with disabilities look upon us to defend their rights. Let us not vote to eliminate them. Let us make them proud and reject H.R. 620.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the House Judiciary Committee, over decades, has heard testimony from many disabled owners of businesses, several of whom have testified before the committee who themselves have been extorted by trial lawyers to pay thousands of dollars to lawyers. That money could have been spent on making small adjustments to the premises to easily overlooked technical violations.

Let me give you an example. Take the testimony of Donna Batelaan, who owned a store for the disabled, and herself used a wheelchair. It was a store devoted entirely to selling accessibility devices and similar items.

She was made to pay $2,000 in attorneys' fees for a simple fix that cost $100. Clearly, Mrs. Batelaan was deeply interested in accommodating the disabled, yet she, too, was caught up in a legal shakedown.

She said the following before the House Judiciary Committee: ''We have co-owned a mobility equipment business in south Florida for the last 20 years. Our parking lot and our building are totally wheelchair accessible. We employ two people who use wheelchairs, and we ourselves use wheelchairs, and all of our customers have mobility limitation. We had not painted the lines and posted a sign on''—just one of the—''handicapped spot that is required by ADA. An attorney from New Jersey, without notice, filed a suit against us. It cost us less than $100 to correct the infractions and $2,000 for attorneys' fees.''

''The original intent of ADA was to provide access and opportunity to American life for all people with disabilities, not to give the legal profession an opportunity to make more money.''

As Abraham Lincoln's name was mentioned previously, I want to quote him on the subject of unnecessary and wasteful litigation. In his notes on a

law lecture he delivered, here is what Abraham Lincoln had to say: ''Discourage litigation. Point out to them how the nominal winner is often a real loser—in fees, expenses, and waste of time. As a peacemaker, the lawyer has a superior opportunity of being a good man. There will still be business enough.''

And finally, to that same point, I have to say it is simply ethical practice for lawyers to give a business a heads-up of a potential violation before a lawsuit is filed.

There are many other examples in Federal law where that notice to the defendant to cure, including in civil rights actions, is afforded. It should be afforded here as well.

Indeed, the vast majority of lawyers do what this bill requires as a matter of simple ethical lawyering. But many lawyers don't act professionally, and they abuse the law to shake down businesses, taking money away from compliance and putting it into their own pockets.

All this bill does is require those unscrupulous trial lawyers to do what ethical lawyers already do: give fair notice of a violation before thousands of dollars in attorneys' fees are racked up against a small business, diverting money away from accessibility where it belongs.

Mr. Chairman, this is the right correction addressing this problem. It will enhance accessibility, it will encourage more work to be done, and it will not deprive anybody the opportunity to notify people that they have a problem with accessibility at their business. If they don't fix it, they will then be the subject of that very lawsuit.

But the opportunity to fix it in a prompt fashion is, I think, critically important to making accessibility more available and helping small businesses in America to succeed, thrive, and create even more jobs for people with those disabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 620, the ADA Education and Reform Act of 2017. This is overdue legislation that will increase protections for individuals with disabilities while providing business and property owners the opportunity to remedy ADA infractions before unnecessary lawsuits and the costs that accompany litigation. Under the current ADA law, lawyers may collect fees when suing businesses or property owners, but plaintiffs cannot collect damages. The current system has created ''drive-by'' demand letters sent by lawyers, like a bulk mailer, to every location on Main St. or at a small mall. In some cases it was not clear that the plaintiff had even attempted to access the property or had even gone inside. The emphasis was on filing the lawsuit and collecting fees without regard for increasing accessibility for the disabled. Sometimes the infractions are easily corrected: signage, soap dispenser heights.

In my district in east San Diego County we have quaint, older towns that are notable for their historical structures dating back to the 1800s. These communities are proud of their heritage and these buildings are a source of local pride and tourism. In Julian, an old gold mining and apple growing town, the Julian Town Hall was threatened by a lawsuit. A public relations stunt was held there where someone crawled up the steps of the town hall, cameras rolling, despite the fact that a handicap accessible ramp was located on the side of the building. In Ramona, a predatory lawyer targeted every business on Main St. with various and frivolous claims. It is for these and other reasons I introduced similar legislation, H.R. 777, the ADA Notification Act of 2013.

With the ''notice and cure'' provision in H.R. 620, drive-by lawsuits will be eliminated, business will have an opportunity to remedy any deficiency, and there will be increased compliance and correction because property and business owners cannot defer the corrections.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the rule which makes in order H.R. 620, the ''ADA Education and Reform Act,'' legislation that would infringe on important civil rights of Americans who live with physical disabilities.

I am deeply troubled that the House of Representatives is taking up H.R. 620, legislation that would remove any incentive businesses currently have to comply with this longstanding civil rights law and undermining protections that allow millions to live independently and in the dignified manner they deserve.

There are about 57 million Americans with disabilities; that number translates to 1 in 5 Americans.

There are 31 million Americans with physical disabilities who use a wheelchair, cane, crutches, or a walker.

And for that I commend former President George H.W. Bush, along with many members of Congress, for their leadership in passing the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, legislation that made our country's public spaces more accessible to those with disabilities.

H.R. 620 would require disabled persons to notify businesses of a violation of the ADA's public accommodation provisions contained in title III of the act, and wait up to 180 days to remedy that alleged violation before a lawsuit could be filed, presenting a direct undermining of the civil rights of Americans with disabilities.

The ''notice and cure'' framework included in this bill would fundamentally change the structure of the ADA's public accommodations title and remove any reasons for business to comply proactively with the law.

H.R. 620's notice and cure provisions will have the effect of inappropriately shifting the burden of enforcing compliance with a federal civil rights statute from the alleged wrongdoer onto the discrimination victim.

Moreover, it would undermine the carefully calibrated voluntary compliance regime that is one of the hallmarks of the ADA, a regime formed through negotiations between the disability rights community and the business community when the. ADA was being drafted 28 years ago.

H.R. 620 would, instead, perversely incentivize a public accommodation to not comply with the ADA unless and until it receives a notice of a violation pursuant to H.R. 620's notice provision.

Finally, the bill does nothing to address the problem that its proponents seek to address, which is the purported concern with the filing of meritless lawsuits by certain plaintiffs' attorneys, a problem (to the extent that it is actually a problem) that is one of state law, not the federal ADA.

This is not the first time in this Congress, or even this year, that I witness the Republicans, allegedly a party for state's rights, completely undermine the established idea that tort law should be left for states to legislate without interference from federal mandates.

H.R. 620's proponents have never adequately articulated why federal law must be amended to address a problem driven by state law.

Also, the bill makes no attempt to distinguish between meritorious and non-meritorious lawsuits and would, instead, impose its harmful and unnecessary requirements on all ADA claims, regardless of potential merit.

I remain adamantly opposed to any effort to weaken the ability of individuals to enforce their rights under federal civil rights laws and I am concerned that H.R. 620 would undermine the key enforcement mechanism of the ADA and other civil rights laws, namely, the ability to file private lawsuits to enforce rights.

Joining me and my colleagues in opposition is a broad coalition of 236 disability rights groups, including:

American Foundation for the Blind, the Bazelon Center for Mental Health, the Christopher and Dana Reeve Foundation, the National Council on Independent Living, the National Disability Rights Network, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Vietnam Veterans of America, the AFL-CIO, the Anti-Defamation League, Human Rights Campaign, the NAACP, and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

Additionally, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights opposes the bill because it would ''remove incentives for businesses to comply with the law unless and until people with disabilities are denied access'' which ''would lead to the continued exclusion of people with disabilities from the mainstream of society and would turn back the clock on disability rights in America.''

Likewise, the American Civil Liberties Union opposes H.R. 620 because it would ''fundamentally alter [the] way in which a person with a disability enforces their civil rights and would severely limit access to places of public accommodations.''

For the foregoing reasons and those discussed below, we strongly oppose H.R. 620 and respectfully dissent from the Committee report.

While it is very important to protect small and growing businesses, we can do so without jeopardizing the rights of disabled individuals to have a day in court.

I do not believe that we have crossed the T's and dotted the I's with all the information that we should have in trying to improve our situation and address the concerns of many small businesses.

Small businesses are the heartbeat of America and the backbone of successful communities, which is why I have served as one of their strongest advocates during my tenure in Congress.

But the reality is that H.R. 620 does not help small businesses, it only hurts the disabled.

I do, however, hope that we can achieve this balanced goal through a different avenue.

So today I stand with Ranking Member NADLER, Congressman LANGEVIN and all those who stand for civil rights and for the rights of Americans with disabilities.

For these reasons I oppose the rule governing H.R. 620.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, when the Americans with Disabilities Act was first signed into law, President George H.W. Bush praised this bill for its assurance "that people with disabilities [were] given the basic guarantees for which they have worked so long and so hard: independence, freedom of choice, control of their lives, and the opportunity to blend fully and equally into the rich mosaic of the American mainstream." His words were true when the ADA passed, and they are true today.

H.R. 620 would reverse decades of progress. It would pave the way for businesses to delay or completely avoid complying with the ADA, and shift the onus on people with disabilities to report noncompliance. If this bill were signed into law, it would effectively hold harmless places of public accommodation for willfully failing to comply with the ADA.

This legislation purports to curb "drive-by" lawsuits, which can be a legitimate problem, but these suits have arisen predominantly in states that provide for recovery of money damages in their state laws. The federal ADA does not provide for damages, only injunctive relief and attorney's fees.

This would be a step backwards. We have a responsibility to protect these safeguards and ensure that people with disabilities are provided accessible accommodations.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 620) to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to promote compliance through education, to clarify the requirements for demand letters, to provide for a notice and cure period before the commencement of a private civil action, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1027

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 10 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.

ADA EDUCATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 736 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 620.

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

□ 1028

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 620) to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to promote compliance through education, to clarify the requirements for demand letters, to provide for a notice and cure period before the commencement of a private civil action, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate pursuant to House Resolution 736 had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 620

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 "ADA Education and Reform Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. COMPLIANCE THROUGH EDUCATION.

Based on existing funding, the Disability Rights Section of the Department of Justice shall, in consultation with property owners and representatives of the disability rights community, develop a program to educate State and local governments and property owners on effective and efficient strategies for promoting access to public accommodations for persons with a disability (as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12102)). Such program may include training for professionals such as Certified Access Specialists to provide a guidance of remediation for potential violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

SEC. 3. NOTICE AND CURE PERIOD.

Paragraph (1) of section 308(a) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12188(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) AVAILABILITY OF REMEDIES AND PROCEDURES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the remedies and procedures set forth in section 204(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a–3(a)) are the remedies and procedures this title provides to any person who is being subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability in violation of this title or who has reasonable grounds for believing that such person is about to be subjected to discrimination in violation of section 303. Nothing in this section shall require a person with a disability to engage in a futile gesture if such person has actual notice that a person or organization covered by this title does not intend to comply with its provisions.

"(B) BARRIERS TO ACCESS TO EXISTING PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS.—A civil action under section 302 or 303 based on the failure to remove an architectural barrier to access into an existing public accommodation may not be commenced by a person aggrieved by such failure unless—

"(i) that person has provided to the owner or operator of the accommodation a written notice specific enough to allow such owner or operator to identify the barrier; and

"(ii)(I) during the period beginning on the date the notice is received and ending 60 days after that date, the owner or operator fails to provide to that person a written description outlining improvements that will be made to remove the barrier; or

"(II) if the owner or operator provides the written description under subclause (I), the owner or operator fails to remove the barrier or to make substantial progress in removing the barrier during the period beginning on the date the description is provided and ending 120 days after that date.

"(C) SPECIFICATION OF DETAILS OF ALLEGED VIOLATION.—The written notice required under subparagraph (B) must also specify in detail the circumstances under which an individual was actually denied access to a public accommodation, including the address of property, the specific sections of the Americans with Disabilities Act alleged to have been violated, whether a request for assistance in removing an architectural barrier to access was made, and whether the barrier to access was a permanent or temporary barrier.".

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. MEDIATION FOR ADA ACTIONS RELATED TO ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS.

The Judicial Conference of the United States shall, under rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or any other applicable law, in consultation with property owners and representatives of the disability rights community, develop a model program to promote the use of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, including a stay of discovery during mediation, to resolve claims of architectural barriers to access for public accommodations. To the extent practical, the Federal Judicial Center should provide a public comment period on any such proposal. The goal of the model program shall be to promote access quickly and efficiently without the need for costly litigation. The model program should include an expedited method for determining the relevant facts related to such barriers to access and steps taken before the commencement of litigation to resolve any issues related to access.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 115–559. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1030

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 115–559.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer my amendment to H.R. 620.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 7, strike ''Based on existing funding'' and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Based on existing funding

Page 3, insert after line 18 the following:

(b) MATERIALS PROVIDED IN OTHER LANGUAGES.—The Disability Rights Section of the Department of Justice shall take appropriate actions, to the extent practicable, to make technical assistance publications relating to compliance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act available in all the languages commonly used by owners and operators of United States businesses.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 736, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would ensure that the Department of Justice takes appropriate actions to provide ADA compliance materials for businessowners whose primary language is not English.

As a Representative from California's Central Valley, my district is far too familiar with the kinds of abusive lawsuits H.R. 620 aims to curb.

For years, small businesses—some that make less than $30,000 a year—have been targeted by ''drive-by'' lawsuits from people who are driving by—many of whom are from outside of our State and, certainly, outside of our community. They have been slapped with demands for thousands, even tens of thousands, of dollars for minor infractions, like faded parking signs or outdated signage or stripes in the parking lot.

More often than not, the lawyer or plaintiff didn't even enter the business in the first place. In too many cases, these lawsuits did not lead to compliance. They led to shakedowns and shutdowns.

Throughout California and, certainly, throughout California's Central Valley, we have seen a number of minority businesses and businesses as a whole, small businesses, that have been shut down by many of these shakedown lawsuits where the attorney will call back and say: I understand that you can't pay us today, but we will put you on a monthly plan.

That doesn't solve any problems for those with disabilities. It certainly doesn't solve any problems for the businesses. All it does is line the pockets of some abusers that are coming into our area that will target dozens of businesses in a day's or week's time, only to leave our community without even going into these businesses.

In my district alone, Barnwood Restaurant in Ripon was sued and shut down. Main Street Inn in Ripon was sued. Country Ford Trucks in Ceres was sued. The city hall in Escalon was sued.

In Turlock, my hometown, seven businesses less than a mile apart on the same road were sued by the same plaintiff. Forty-three businesses in the city of Modesto were all sued by the same plaintiff.

California has been ground zero for this lawsuit abuse. Even the State legislature in a State that is not considered conservative by any means has had a number of ADA lawsuit measures aimed at trying to curb those.

The Federal Government has a job to fix this, and that is one of the reasons that I am a coauthor and support the ADA Education and Reform Act. I especially support its provisions to increase businessowner education on ADA compliance, which I believe my amendment can help to strengthen.

In California, 75 percent of the businesses targeted by these types of lawsuits are immigrant- or minority-owned businesses. These demographics are more unlikely to be familiar with ADA standards as well as their own legal rights. That is the reason for the shakedown of these minority-owned businesses.

One obstacle for these types of businesspeople is that the vast majority of the DOJ's compliance resources aren't readily available in other languages that they may need to be made available. For example, key sections of a Spanish-translated web page haven't been updated for 3 years and doesn't include close to the number of materials available in English. With a district like mine that is over 40 percent Hispanic, this is a real problem.

If you want businesses to comply with the law, you have to give these businesses the opportunity to comply. Give them the ability to read from their own website what new laws are going into effect every single year. Because if only the lawyers know, then the shakedowns will continue to occur and businesses will continue to lose more of their profits and be unable to provide raises and bonuses to their employees. But worse than that, you will continue to see small businesses shut down.

Let me finish on one final note. A few years ago I received a phone call in my office. We had been focused on ADA lawsuit abuse for quite some time. I talked to the lady about her concerns. She explained how she had received a notice in the mail and then a follow-up notice. No attorney had ever come into her restaurant—a small-business owner. She was just trying to make ends meet. In fact, she was not only the proprietor of this restaurant, but she worked the kitchen. In fact, she started the business and worked the front end and the back end. She was the first to come and the last to leave.

We have heard a lot of these stories about small businesses and the regulatory impacts that they face. But in this case, I was amazed to find out when I visited that she was more than happy to fix any ADA compliance issue. As she wheeled around in her wheelchair from her kitchen to the cash register, and her Spanish language being the first language that she knew, she wanted to fix things for her customers and fix things for those who are coming in with disabilities.

We need to give her the opportunity to do that.

Mr. Chair, I ask for support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I want to first commend the gentleman from California for addressing this issue. He is quite right that it is important that, in order to expeditiously make sure that accommodations for the disabled are made, people have to understand what those requirements are. The regulations on this change frequently and constantly.

I do not oppose this amendment. In fact, I support it. I would ask the gentleman if he would work with us moving forward to make sure that this does not impose an inordinate burden on the bureaucracy responsible for putting this out so as to delay getting new regulations to protect the ADA folks out.

There are many languages spoken by people in various businesses in this country. Some are very common, and that is definitely the case, but we may not have this written in every single language that is spoken by every single individual.

Mr. DENHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, I look forward to working with the gentleman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I thank Mr. DENHAM for offering this amendment and letting us all know some of the drive-by lawsuit problems in California.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Justice, for example, has come up with 250 pages of regulations recently about the ADA. These regulations are sent out to the businesses. It is important, as the gentleman from California has mentioned, that these businesses be able to understand what those regulations are because many of these businesses that are being targeted by unscrupulous lawyers are minority-owned businesses, some first-generation Americans who have come into our country trying to make ends meet.

So the amendment is a good idea. I support the amendment, and I urge all Members of this body to vote for it as well.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 115–559.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 6, line 2.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 736, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment with my colleague and fellow Bipartisan Disabilities Caucus cochair, Representative GREGG HARPER. I want to mention that it is the only bipartisan amendment being offered to H.R. 620, and I think it is important to stress this point.

Mr. Chairman, two Members of Congress from different political parties—who represent a caucus that exists solely to inform, educate, and highlight issues impacting the disability community—have come together to say that there is something gravely wrong with this bill.

We are offering an amendment that would make it palatable. The amendment would strike H.R. 620's notice and cure requirement. As presently written, the notice and cure section mandates that someone who claims discrimination on the basis of a disability relating to an architectural barrier must provide a written notice that allows 60 days in order to acknowledge receipt of the complaint and 120 days to demonstrate substantial progress in removing the barrier before further legal action may be pursued.

That is 6 months of waiting without a guarantee that the architectural barrier will be removed and access granted. So the idea that places of public accommodation must first receive a notice before correctly implementing a law that has been part of our legal framework for nearly three decades creates an obvious disincentive for ADA compliance.

The proposal of a notice ignores the tenets of the ADA that support an indisputable right to inclusion and respect. No other civil rights law requires protected class members to hand a notice to people behaving in a discriminatory manner in order to educate them without any guarantee the situation will improve.

This amendment would keep program funding for the ADA education. It also maintains language supporting alternative mediation pathways relating to architectural barriers outside of the existing framework within the Department of Justice.

If supporters of H.R. 620 truly believe these State-based nuisance lawsuits are the result of a lack of knowledge of what the Federal ADA requires, and that businesses need less costly avenues to remedy violations, then why wouldn't they support an amendment that provides an answer to both of those claims without the harm of a notice and cure period that weakens the civil rights protections of the ADA?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider the consequences of a bill that delays justice for people with disabilities in a way that no other class protected by civil rights laws must endure when asserting their civil rights. I then urge my colleagues to consider whether the delay of a notice and cure requirement adequately addresses the underlying issue of ''drive-by'' lawsuits.

I am hopeful that doing so will result in a decision to support this amendment to remove the harmful notice requirement, while maintaining provisions that increase access to education and mediation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I must oppose this amendment because it would completely gut the notice and cure provisions, which are the core provisions of this bill. The need for a notice and cure period has been highlighted in congressional hearings since the early 2000s.

In 2016, David Weiss, who testified on behalf of the International Council of Shopping Centers, stated:

> The problem that the private sector faces is an increasing number of lawsuits typically brought by a few plaintiffs in various jurisdictions and often by the same lawyers for very technical and usually minor violations. It has become all too common for property owners to settle these cases, as it is less expensive to settle them than to defend them, even if the property owner is compliant. It is often too costly to prove that a property owner is doing what is right or required. Therefore, the property owner makes a rational business decision commonly resulting in settlement.

Mr. Chairman, given that plaintiffs' attorneys' motives are often monetary, there is little or no incentive to work with businesses to cure a violation before a lawsuit is filed. This unintended result wastes resources on the cost of litigation that could have been used to improve access sooner. This delays justice.

H.R. 620 remedies these problems by allowing businesses a finite period of time, before a private enforcement lawsuit can be filed, to fix defects on their premises once they are notified that these premises do not comply with the ADA.

This will reduce abuses of the law by opportunistic lawyers. It will result in more access for the disabled because it encourages businesses to cure their access issues now in order to avoid costly litigation later.

Mr. Chair, I would also note that made in order is an amendment coming up that would reduce this amount of time by 2 months, the total amount of time for notice and cure.

I think that is a good step to address the concerns raised, but I cannot support an amendment that completely takes away the purpose of the legislation, which is to give small-business owners the opportunity to cure a problem once they are made aware of it. Many of these are very technical violations of the law designed primarily to line the pockets of some unscrupulous lawyers, as opposed to really helping advance the cause of accessibility.

For those reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I proudly yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who is the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Langevin-Harper amendment. This bipartisan amendment removes from the bill its onerous and unjustified notice and cure provisions while leaving in place its potentially helpful educational and mediation-related provisions.

As I discussed extensively during general debate, the notice and cure provisions would have the effect of drastically weakening the ability of discrimination victims enforcing their rights in court.

Any law, including the ADA, is only effective to the extent that it is enforceable, and civil rights statutes, particularly, depend primarily on private rights of action for their enforcement. By weakening enforcement, H.R. 620's notice and cure provisions ultimately undermine the ADA's goal of integrating people with disabilities into the mainstream of American life.

For these reasons, I urge the House to adopt the Langevin-Harper amendment which cures most of the problems with this bill.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, again, I urge support of my amendment. The whole point of this amendment is to remove the notice and cure provision.

Again, the ADA law has been around for nearly three decades now. People should be proactive about understanding what their responsibilities are

to operate businesses or issues of public accommodation, to understand what their responsibilities are. Not, basically, taking that responsibility incentivizes people to say: Well, just wait and see if there is an issue, and only if we get notified will we then fix the problem.

People need to be proactive and comply with the law, and I believe, there, everybody wins.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, as I indicated, because the ADA is a regulation-based law, and those regulations are constantly changing as new technology changes and as accessibility to new features that businesses offer are desired by those in the disability community.

That is a necessary thing, but it is also necessary to make sure that businesses have time to accommodate as well and learn about those new requirements and have the opportunity to fix it before somebody can just get attorney's fees for something that is going to be done anyway.

So I think the better approach is to oppose this amendment and support the underlying bill with the addition of an amendment coming up that would reduce that time by 2 months.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

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

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115–559.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 10, insert after ''in violation of section 303'' the following: '', except that if a violation continues to occur after the expiration of the applicable period provided for under subparagraph (B), the court may, in addition to any other available relief, award punitive damages in such amount as the court determines appropriate''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 736, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, since the start of the debate on this legislation, I have been laser-focused on getting the problems with ADA compliance actually fixed. The problems of drive-by lawsuits have hit my district, and abusive demand letters are a problem nationwide. One of the tragedies of the status quo is that, even after settlement of demand letters, the problems are often not even fixed.

Many of my colleagues have expressed concern, however, that the underlying text of this legislation would not provide sufficient incentive for legitimate civil rights attorneys to take to court businesses that offer no good faith effort to solve the problem with ADA compliance after they have been pointed out.

My amendment simply would allow courts to award punitive damages in the cases that a business has made no good faith effort to remove a barrier to access. If they cure the problem, the matter is resolved; if not, they should be subject to the full force of the law, including punitive damages.

Since its enactment, the Americans with Disabilities Act has allowed millions of Americans to gain access to public accommodations that many of us take for granted. The passage of the ADA was a major civil rights victory. Many more schools, hospitals, grocery stores, and movie theaters are now accessible. Thanks to the ADA, many of our fellow citizens are fully integrated into the fabric of society.

Despite these gains, however, more still remains to be done. As people with disabilities have continued to work to make our public accommodations more accessible, unfortunately, some individuals have found ways to use the current system for their own financial benefit.

The underlying bill aims to prevent unscrupulous individuals from taking advantage of the law and to establish a process leading to increased compliance. However, during many meetings with disability groups in my district over their concerns, some voiced fears that the underlying bill would discourage attorneys from taking ADA cases.

My amendment would work to create an incentive for lawyers to take ADA cases, knowing that, if a business does not comply, punitive damages may be sought. The goal is that individuals with disabilities have access to competent legal representation in order to bring meritorious cases against businesses that seek to purposely avoid compliance with the ADA.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment because it would defeat the whole purpose of the bill, which is to resolve access issues under title III without the need for expensive litigation. The private enforcement provisions provided in title III of the ADA are already a powerful tool to achieve greater accessibility through injunctive relief.

Importantly, the ADA does not provide for damages in private lawsuits; it never has. This amendment would then, for the first time, allow such damages, which will drive up litigation costs and provide even more fodder for trial lawyers to abuse the law. Businesses should use their resources to fix access to problems, not to pay unnecessary and wasteful litigation costs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to answer by saying that my goal in this amendment has nothing to do with the plaintiff's bar. It has to do with getting the problems fixed without going to court.

Unfortunately, I think without at least the threat of punitive damages, I think it is a legitimate question as to whether some fraction of the violations of the ADA will, in fact, not be fixed as part of the calculation of cost benefit. I think that is not the way we should solve this in this country.

It is a time in this country when a lot of our justice system—our courts—are coming under attack, and I actually have faith in the judges and courts in our country to make a reasonable judgment as to whether or not there was a good faith effort made to fix this fundamental law in our country.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comment about having faith in judges. As a former judge, I appreciate that comment.

When the ADA legislation was debated here on this House floor in 1990, there was discussion about this whole issue. The purpose of the ADA legislation that passed Congress was to fix the problems that businesses had in accessibility for the disabled. It was not designed for punitive damages at all. It was designed to fix the problem. That is why the underlying legislation that we are sponsoring today makes businesses move in a timely manner if there is a violation.

So this would change the whole concept of the ADA. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 115–559.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 12, insert after ''barrier or'' the following: '', in the case of a barrier, the removal of which requires additional time as a result of circumstances beyond the control of the owner or operator, fails''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 736, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, the ADA is a powerful and important law that we all respect and embrace. Unfortunately, in States like California, it has created a cottage industry of unscrupulous attorneys abusing title III of the ADA.

The amendment I am offering is very simple. The current language in the bill permits a business notified of noncompliance with the ADA to simply make substantial progress in remedying the violation. Frankly, this language is too loose. My amendment strengthens this language to only permit the language of ''substantial progress'' where they cannot complete the work because of extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment promotes basic fairness. It does not allow dishonest property owners to abandon responsibility by claiming they have made substantial progress. The message is still clear: businesses must fix their ADA violations.

Today is a chance to pass something that addresses the real problem. Let's not let the lack of a perfect solution get in the way of real progress.

I want to speak to some of the issues that we have had in California.

In California, this particular law has created an industry that allows for lawyers to make a lot of money off of small businesses. It has basically allowed shady law firms to make a profit out of abusing the ADA, often resulting in high legal bills and no fix to the allegations presented.

In many cases, businesses are forced into settlements because the cost of fighting an allegation is so great. The average cost of a settlement is $16,000, but the cost of fighting the allegation is sometimes four to six times the average $75,000 income generated by the business.

In California, a simple fix—putting up a sign or moving a door a few inches—can carry a $4,000 penalty, the minimum amount of damages, which will still be in place when the bill passes. This is no small sum if you are a local bakery, a neighborhood grocery store, or a barber shop.

California is ground zero for this problem. It is home to 12 percent of the disabled population but 40 percent of ADA lawsuits nationwide. From 2012 to 2014, 54 percent of all related complaints in California were filed by just two law firms.

The law firms sometimes recruit plaintiffs who are not directly impacted by the ADA or even living in the same State. Fourteen plaintiffs brought 46 percent of all these lawsuits. One of them, Robert McCarthy, filed more than 400 suits against California businesses, and he doesn't even live in the State.

One infamous example is the California-based Moore Law Firm, which filed more than 700 lawsuits over the past few years, resulting in large settlements and sometimes even bankruptcy for some businesses. Given recent laws to address this in my home State, trial lawyers are rushing to States like Texas, New York, and Florida, where they can make a profit.

In 2014, a bar owner living in Torrance, California, was handed five lawsuits in the past 2 years and needed to save up to $30,000 to remodel. She was the target of a small group of attorneys who took aim at businesses in shopping centers for a quick profit.

What we need to do, Mr. Chairman, is take the profit out of making these facilities accessible. We all want them to be accessible. We want to give them notice and a couple of months to cure the problem or else the lawsuit can continue. I think this makes a lot of sense.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not appear to make any substantive change to H.R. 620. Whether or not the amendment is adopted, it still would be the case under the bill that a businessowner who fails to make substantial progress in removing an access barrier would be subject to a lawsuit.

The amendment, however, does not address the fundamental concerns with H.R. 620's notice and cure provisions that I expressed in general debate, including the fact that the bill does not require a business to comply with the ADA, only to make ''substantial progress'' toward compliance within the bill's 180-day cure period.

While the amendment does not make the bill worse, it also does not make the bill better. Regrettably, therefore, I must oppose the amendment.

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

□ 1100

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment and being the original sponsor of this legislation. I support the amendment. The substantial progress provision in H.R. 620 provides needed flexibility in cases in which removing a barrier is halted for reasons beyond the business' control.

For example, a business may not be able to pour concrete in Alaska during the winter to fix a ramp. Likewise, a business may find that getting a building permit from their local government is taking longer than expected.

In these cases, as well as other unexpected events, the substantial progress provision provides judges with a discretionary standard to determine whether the improvements and progress by the business are both material and meaningful.

This clarifying amendment further defines the term ''substantial progress'' to make clear that circumstances beyond the business' control—owner—are the only allowable justifications for not making substantial progress within the required time.

The amendment will help provide more access for the disabled. I support it because it makes this legislation better.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, let me close by saying this: I wholeheartedly support the letter and the spirit of this law. I recognize how important it is. This law is powerful, but it has been weaponized by lawyers who are trying to make a quick buck.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BERA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 115–559.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 15, strike ''120'' and insert ''60''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 736, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chair, the Americans with Disabilities Act is landmark civil rights legislation. Americans with disabilities face real challenges every day. We should strive to support them every way we can.

When Congress passes a law, we have an obligation to make sure that legislation is working and see if improvements can be made. Under the ADA, business owners are responsible to make sure their business is fully accessible to those with disabilities. However, in some cases, business owners are unaware they are in violation of the ADA.

Most Americans can agree: rather than immediately face lawsuits for violations, business owners should be given time to actually fix what is wrong. This solution advances our shared goal of improved access for all members of the community. But in listening to my constituents in Sacramento County, many are concerned that the timeframe for fixing these violations was too long. And I agree.

In response, my amendment would cut the time businesses have to fix violations in half. This means, after the notification period, a business has 60 days to fix violations, instead of 120 days in the current bill.

In some cases, these barriers can and should be immediately addressed. But in a State like California, which is prone to earthquakes, construction permits can take time. Small businesses should be given a reasonable amount of time to make changes and better serve their customers.

Having heard both sides of this debate, I believe we can, and should, find a compromise that works for both. I have seen how hard Sacramento small businesses work and how important they are for growing our economy and creating good-paying jobs. As a doctor, I have seen firsthand the challenges of those with disabilities. This amendment seeks the middle ground and is a commonsense improvement.

Americans with disabilities deserve to live full, healthy lives, unafraid of barriers that restrict their movement.

Now, let me be clear: if a business does not make the modifications to obstructions once notified, they should be held accountable and there should be consequences.

When we work across the aisle, Washington can get things done for the American people. This amendment is a commonsense fix that makes the bill better.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise, again, in opposition to this amendment.

While I thank the gentleman from California for stressing the importance of providing opportunities for places of public accommodation to learn that they are in violation of the ADA, I disagree with the premise that the onus of enforcement should be placed on people with disabilities by requiring them to issue arduous and detailed notices.

There are free resources available that provide information and technical assistance to the public on the requirements of the ADA.

I can't stress this enough: when someone owns a business, they have to balance a variety of regulations and requirements at both the State and Federal Government level. Why should the requirements that their business be accessible to people with disabilities, requirements that have been in existence for decades, be weakened or viewed as less important?

Why should business owners be given a free pass until someone catches a violation before they comply?

The suggestion that we can reduce the timeframe of a notice and cure period misses the point. There is nothing that can be done to improve a notice requirement that shouldn't exist in the first place.

No other civil rights law requires people who experience discrimination to wait for justice or provide a written notice before taking legal action. Why should people with disabilities be treated any differently?

Further, what are the incentives to comply with the ADA in the first place if businesses can wait to be told what is wrong and then maybe fix the issue?

After all, even with a reduction in the notice and cure timeframe, there is still no clear requirement that a barrier actually be removed.

Again, I appreciate my colleague's desire to find a compromise, but this is not the answer.

Whether the notice and cure period is 120 days or 180 days, it does nothing to address the underlying issue of drive-by lawsuits. That is the crux of the problem happening in States that have gone beyond the requirements of the ADA and merely delays access and creates a national policy of apathy on ADA implementation.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The goal of the bill is to provide more access for Americans more quickly. Absent circumstances beyond a business' control, 120 days is sufficient time to remove a barrier. Under this amendment offered by the gentleman, instead of 180 days total, a business would have up to 120 days, instead, to fix access problems.

I believe this amendment improves the bill. I urge its support, and I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, again, while I appreciate my colleague's attempt to find somewhat of a common ground on this issue, it does not address the underlying problem. The issue of the ADA being around for 30 years—it is well-known now. People are even proactive about finding out what their responsibilities are under the ADA, as opposed to just waiting until they are notified of a problem and then perhaps complying with.

No, we should not treat people with disabilities any differently than anyone else who is protected under civil rights laws. That is why we have them in the first place.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Let's work together on finding a better common-ground solution. But this amendment and the underlying bill is not the answer.

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chair, this amendment makes the bill better. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 115–559.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, beginning on line 22, strike ''the specific sections of the Americans with Disabilities Act alleged to have been violated,''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 736, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will make it easier for a disabled American to provide a business with a notice of an ADA violation.

Violations of the ADA can be very technical. The Department of Justice has hundreds, if not thousands, of pages of regulations and guidance documents on complying with the public accommodation requirements of title III of the ADA. Given that the Department of Justice will not certify whether a business' property is ADA compliant, these ADA requirements are often left to the interpretation of plaintiffs' lawyers.

The notice provisions of H.R. 620 require that those who allege a business is violating the ADA must provide the business with a description of ''the specific sections of the Americans with Disabilities Act alleged to have been violated.'' This provision was designed to ensure that businesses have a clear picture of the alleged violation with the business.

However, this requirement may go too far. Accordingly, the amendment removes this requirement, making clear that written notices provided by disabled individuals can be written in plain English, without legalese.

Removing this requirement will also facilitate a dialogue between the individual and the business. Additionally, it may avoid any need for a disabled individual to hire a lawyer.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the intent behind this amendment to make the notice provision of H.R. 620 slightly less onerous, and I acknowledge that it does so by eliminating the requirement that an aggrieved person cite in his or her initial notice to a business the specific ADA provision being violated.

The amendment, however, still leaves in place the basic problem with the

bill, the basic problem with the notice and cure provision, and that is the notice and cure provision. Therefore, it does not alleviate any of the real concerns with the underlying bill.

Again, the basic notice and cure provisions of the bill turn on its head the normal practice of any civil rights statute in which the burden of compliance is on the actor, not on the victim. Here, we put the burden of compliance on the victim.

The debate has been as if people have not had 28 years to come into compliance, only to find out they are not in compliance when someone complains about it, some victim is victimized. That is just wrong. This goes in exactly the wrong direction.

Although this amendment would slightly alleviate the provision, it is putting lipstick on a pig. For this reason and in deference to the disability rights community, which opposes this amendment and the pre-suit notice and cure requirements, I must oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I want to remind folks that notice requirement is required even under title VII of the Civil Rights Act. It is also required under title I of the original ADA legislation. So this is not a new phenomena.

This legislation and this amendment gives potential plaintiffs the ability to advise and put a business on notice without even having to hire a lawyer with the legalese requirements that are written by the Department of Justice, which constantly updates what requirements are under the ADA.

The intention is to simply have the violation described in a way that is sufficient to put the business on notice of what the ADA violation is.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that all Members support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 7 will not be offered.

□ 1115

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 620) to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to promote compliance through education, to clarify the requirements for demand letters, to provide for a notice and cure period before the commencement of a private civil action, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1120

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes a.m.

ADA EDUCATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 736 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 620.

Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) kindly assume the chair.

□ 1121

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 620) to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to promote compliance through education, to clarify the requirements for demand letters, to provide for a notice and cure period before the commencement of a private civil action, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 115–559 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 115–559 offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 226, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

AYES—188

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Beatty
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Comstock
Connolly
Costello (PA)
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reichert
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoder

NOES—226

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris

Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Peters
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—16

Bass
Bishop (GA)
Cheney
Costa
Courtney
Cummings
Deutch
Duncan (SC)
Gaetz
Gutiérrez
Johnson (GA)
LoBiondo
Pearce
Rogers (KY)
Turner
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1146

Messrs. KELLY of Pennsylvania, WITTMAN, FOSTER, COFFMAN, DENT, and YOHO changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. LANCE and PETERSON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) assumed the chair.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery, in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

Mr. WOMACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 620) to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to promote compliance through education, to clarify the requirements for demand letters, to provide for a notice and cure period before the commencement of a private civil action, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 736, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 192, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—225

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Zeldin

NAYS—192

Adams
Barletta
Barragán
Beatty
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Comstock
Connolly
Costello (PA)
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reichert
Richmond
Rosen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—13

Bass	Cummings	Pearce
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Rogers (KY)
Cheney	Duncan (SC)	Wasserman Schultz
Costa	Gutiérrez	
Courtney	LoBiondo	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1156

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Can the Chair tell us when the House may muster the courage to take up the issue of gun violence?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

APPOINTMENT AS INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Speaker, majority leader and minority leader, their joint appointment, pursuant to clause 6 of rule II, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of Mr. Michael Ptasienski, McLean, Virginia, as Inspector General for the U.S. House of Representatives.

BALTIC STATES CELEBRATE THEIR CENTENNIAL

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the upcoming centennial anniversaries of the statehood and independence of the three Baltic States.

This year marks 100 years since the restoration of the state of Lithuania on February 16, and the proclamations of independence of Estonia on February 24, and Latvia on November 18. Thus, in the aftermath of World War I, in 1918, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia declared their independence and marked their beginnings as new republics and their emergence as modern democratic societies.

Despite a history of turmoil, the people of the Baltics have always stood up for their values and worked to maintain their independence, freedom, and sovereignty.

Today, 100 years later, the three Baltic States are strong allies of NATO and full-fledged members of the European Union. They are committed to making the transatlantic community an area of cooperation, partnership, and prosperity. The United States is proud to be strong allies of the Baltic States, and our nations stand together to defend our shared values of freedom and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I extend sincere congratulations and send best wishes to Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia on their centennial observations and anniversary.

WHAT WILL IT TAKE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, what will it take? What will it take for this body to finally grapple with this issue?

Columbine wasn't enough. West Virginia wasn't enough. Colorado, in a movie theater, wasn't enough. A nightclub in Orlando wasn't enough. Newtown wasn't enough.

Mr. Speaker, this has become a national disgrace. Ninety-five percent of the American people say that they believe in sensible gun reform, gun laws that make sense. Ninety-five percent. The minority party does not represent 95 percent of this Nation.

You are in that number as well, yet you still turn your back on the American people. The NRA stands for ''no Republican action.''

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY MARKS ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud Bobcat to recognize Montana State University, which is celebrating its 125th anniversary tomorrow on Founders' Day.

Montana State University, a land-grant university in my hometown of Bozeman, was formed in 1893. Originally, the agricultural college of the State of Montana, the school started with eight students in a small classroom in a local high school.

The college quickly grew to include many other degree paths, including engineering and nursing; two programs for which the school is particularly known.

Today, Montana State University serves over 16,000 students each year. This year's spring enrollment set a new record for the tenth year in a row.

Montana State University is a cornerstone of the Bozeman community, and we are fortunate to have such an institution in our State.

The fact is that the success of my business, as well as that of many others, would not have been possible without Montana State University.

Go, Cats, go.

WE NEED SENSIBLE GUN LAWS

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart, imagining the pain felt in Parkland, Florida. No parent should have to send their children to school each day wondering if they will return home.

While details of the shooting in Florida are still emerging, it is clear this horrific act of violence was perpetrated by an individual in crisis.

I lost my older sister to suicide with a firearm at a young age. What I have learned since is that helping to prevent people in crisis from temporarily having a gun saves lives.

Today, I urge my colleagues to support the Gun Violence Restraining Order Act, allowing family members or law enforcement officials to petition a judge to temporarily remove firearms from an individual in crisis.

For those who keep repeating after each mass shooting that it is too soon to discuss gun violence reform, please consider that for many families, including my own, it is far too late.

We owe these families more than just our thoughts and prayers. We owe them sensible gun laws that protect our children from needless gun violence.

JENNIFER'S STORY OF TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, Jennifer's childhood was violently chaotic. By her early twenties, she was living on the streets, begging and stealing to survive.

After a local gang member suspected that she may have stolen his money, her life became even more horrific and hellish. The gangster beat her mercilessly with a baseball bat until she collapsed, and then he and other gang members pistol-whipped her and burned her with cigarettes. They tattooed their names all over her body, branding her as property. For 6 years, they held her in slavery, forcing her to have sex with countless men for money.

Desperate, Jennifer tried to kill herself, but when the rope broke, she resolved to escape. Luckily for Jennifer, she found a shelter and was able to rebuild her life. She covered up the traffickers' names with flowers and the words ''free yourself.''

We, as a society, owe it to Jennifer and survivors like her to protect them

and put the slave masters in the jailhouse, where they belong.

And that is just the way it is.

DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR JAPANESE INTERNMENT

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

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, over 120,000 Japanese Americans were incarcerated on American soil during World War II.

On the annual Day of Remembrance, we are reminded of the brave men, women, and children who lost everything. They lost their homes, their belongings, their businesses, really keeping only what they could carry with them.

But their spirits were not broken. Countless stories of bravery, courage, and resilience defined an entire generation, including the Nisei-only ''Go For Broke'' 442nd Infantry Regiment, becoming the most highly decorated unit in Army history.

The anniversary of this shameful blight on our history remains a powerful reminder of the fragility of civil rights and the threat that prejudice and divisiveness and bigotry continue to pose to our way of life today.

We must follow in the footsteps of those Japanese Americans who volunteered to serve this country, even with their loved ones incarcerated on American soil, and find the light and love of the Aloha spirit to stand up and fight against intolerance, bigotry, and hatred.

TY MUSE IS BROOME COUNTY'S DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

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

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ty Muse, the CEO of Visions Federal Credit Union, who was recently honored by the Boy Scouts of America and the Baden-Powell Council as the Broome County Distinguished Citizen of the Year.

Each year, this award is given to an individual in the Broome County community who sets a positive example for others and demonstrates concern and significant care for their community.

Mr. Muse moved to the Broome County area 5 years ago and hit the ground running. He has been honored for his commitment to helping young leaders throughout the region by sponsoring a free track program, donating to several local school districts and colleges, and working to raise awareness in financial literacy.

Madam Speaker, I extend both my congratulations and my thanks to Mr. Ty Muse for his hard work and dedication to the Broome County community and for his commitment to inspiring leaders of the future.

THE CFPB—HOW TO KILL A GOOD THING

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, a leader must believe in the mission of the organization he or she heads.

But Donald Trump turned this principle on its head by appointing Mick Mulvaney to head the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Mr. Mulvaney doesn't believe in the agency's mission to protect consumers. In fact, he once said that he doesn't ''like the fact that the CFPB even exists.''

When he was a Member of Congress, he cosponsored legislation to eliminate it. Now, as Director of the CFPB, he wants to zero out its budget for this year.

He eviscerated the CFBP's rules against predatory payday lending, and then dropped all the lawsuits against them. He halted its investigation into Equifax.

As Senator ELIZABETH WARREN pointed out, you should not put someone in charge of an agency when they want to destroy it. He is running it into the ground, and we must stop it. Consumers will pay dearly.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATING GREGORY OLSEN

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Gregory Olsen from Chaska who was recently appointed to serve on the National Honey Board by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Greg will serve a 3-year term alongside 19 other members as the importer-handler representative. The National Honey Board is one of the 22 industry-funded boards authorized by Congress under USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service. Its purpose is to expand domestic markets for honey and honey products.

The National Honey Board is responsible for research and development, advertising and promotion, consumer education, and industry information of the honey industry.

Madam Speaker, Greg brings important industry experience to the table and will assist the National Honey Board in their mission of successful innovative research, education, and promotional work for honey products that many people rely on in Minnesota and across the world.

Congratulations again to Greg Olsen.

CUTTING EPA'S BUDGET

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

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, 26 percent—that is how much Trump and Pruitt want to cut the EPA's budget, a starved agency cut again by a full one-quarter. That is massive cuts of staff, massive cuts to our health and safety, massive cuts to the EPA's ability to do its job.

The day after they proposed those cuts, we learned that Mr. Pruitt likes to fly first class on the taxpayer's dime. Over one stretch last June, taxpayer-funded travel for Scott Pruitt and his aides cost at least $90,000. If the administration wants to look for cuts, maybe Scott Pruitt shouldn't be flying first class to his meetings. Maybe he should have to sit next to the constituents he represents.

Madam Speaker, the EPA's mission is to protect our environment. President Trump's dirty budget wants to cut its budget by $3 billion.

Madam Speaker, we need to be able to protect our health and environment and prioritize funding to do so. It doesn't look like Mr. Pruitt is capable of doing that, even from 40,000 feet in the air.

AMERICANS ARE THRIVING BECAUSE OF TAX REFORM

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share just a few examples of how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is already helping businesses in Georgia's Third District. It is helping them to grow, and it is helping them to reinvest in their workers.

Last month, I had the opportunity to visit such a business, Custom Truck and Body Works, in Woodbury, Georgia. This is a unique company that builds specialty vehicles for first responders. Because of the changes made by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, this small business has been able to hire new workers, is beginning a facility expansion, and, in fact, told me they are still looking for folks to fill positions today.

This isn't the only business in the Third District that is thriving because of tax reform. Another small business, Shred-X, which is a small business that has 10 employees and provides recycling and shredding services to 3,000 clients throughout Atlanta and west central Georgia, plans to use the additional savings to buy a new truck and potentially hire a new employee. For a company of 10 people, this is a huge difference.

Madam Speaker, I am thrilled to see our Main Street job creators thriving because of tax reform, and I look forward to seeing our economy continue to thrive as Americans reap the benefits of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

ADDRESS GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, children and families across the country rely on their leaders in Congress for much more than thoughts and prayers. They need us to take action to keep them safe.

Gun violence in this country is a horrifying epidemic. There have been 18 school shootings in the past 7½ weeks. It is even hard to talk about this.

It is difficult to argue, though, with people who are looking at Congress and wondering whether too many Members in Congress are too close to the NRA and the gun manufacturers. Congress actually passed a law to prevent the CDC from even studying gun violence.

In difficult times, I, too, seek thoughts and prayers from friends, clergy, and family, but this is not stopping the slaughter. I agree with police officers across the country who say: Get the AR–15s out of the hands of dangerous people now. Our children are being massacred in their schools.

Madam Speaker, Speaker RYAN must put bills on the floor to address gun violence or his party will go down in history as the party that blocked solutions to this crisis.

HONORING SHELAGH SWEENEY

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

Mr. FASO. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize Hurley Fire Department member Shelagh Sweeney.

Shelagh was named Hurley Fire Department's first female Firefighter of the Year. Her service and dedication to her community as a firefighter, EMT, and field training officer for mobile life support services is most admirable.

Her inspiration to join the fire department came from her attendance of a first-aid class during her time at SUNY Ulster. Continuing her education by taking classes at Marist College is a testament to the dedication she reflects with her service to her community.

Shelagh's selfless service to the community, while striving for further personal growth, is greatly appreciated, and I wish her the best in continuing on her journey.

INVESTING IN THE NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, this week, the President unveiled a budget proposal that would not only endanger the health and safety of the American people and our environment, but also jeopardize the long-term stability of our infrastructure systems.

It completely ignores what we know about climate change, proposing a 61 percent reduction in funding for renewable energy research and cutting critical enforcement tools and public safety regulations.

It also lacks the foresight to produce a forward-thinking plan that will ensure a stable and resilient infrastructure future. In fact, it seeks to eliminate essential programs like ARPA–E, which supports early stage energy research and development.

Nationwide infrastructure systems like the electric grid must be updated to anticipate severe weather and climate conditions. We have seen the toll that national disasters take on our electric grid.

Smart planning and investment is essential to ensuring that we have the proper resources to maintain and operate these essential structures.

The President has spoken at length about investing in our infrastructure. Now let's see some action.

WORKING WITH ASIA DURING YEAR OF THE DOG

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

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, this week commences the Lunar New Year, a time of thankfulness and new beginnings for the United States and many of our Asian partners.

Reflecting upon last year's Year of the Rooster, we have enjoyed tremendous political, social, and economic achievements. Filled with enthusiasm for diplomacy and cooperation, we continue to look to our partners in Asia to promote peaceful international relations.

During the Year of the Dog, I believe that our friends will continue to embody loyalty, honesty, and integrity, working with us to craft mutually beneficial international policies. In turn, the United States will encourage effective diplomatic behaviors among all of our Asian counterparts.

As lawmakers, we have an obligation to protect the interests of the United States, as well as those of our strong allies around the globe, especially in the Asia-Pacific region.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue to work toward policies that will positively shape strong, multinational Asian foreign relations in 2018.

UNDERFUNDING NATIONAL PARKS

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, from the mighty redwoods to the headlands and beaches of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in my bay area, backyard to the ancient sequoias of Yosemite, to the scorching deserts of Death Valley, we know our national parks are worth protecting.

Parks not only protect nature and wildlife but our history, too. And they are economic engines supporting thousands of jobs. But Donald Trump's dirty budget and infrastructure scam would bulldoze right through this American success story.

Trump is proposing a 7 percent cut to the National Park Service, meaning even less maintenance and visitor services, and a 17 percent cut to the Department of the Interior overall, while giving Secretary Ryan Zinke free rein to continue his drilling spree on our public lands.

These cuts, combined with Trump's ongoing effort to hike entry fees for working families, threaten access to these places that drive millions of visitors to our communities and small businesses each year, while generating hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity.

Underfunding our national parks puts visitor access at risk. We should reject this budget and work together.

ADA IMPROVEMENTS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, the Americans with Disabilities Act has played an important role in improving accessibility for many years.

Unfortunately, it is often taken advantage of by dishonest attorneys who file drive-by lawsuits against small businesses in order to get a quick payday. This entails coercing a business owner into paying expensive settlements or legal fees for unintended or technical violations and vague interpretations of the ADA. This practice has risen dramatically. From just 2013 to 2017, ADA lawsuits in Federal courts have increased by 182 percent, and it goes beyond that for many years previously as well.

This practice violates the spirit of the law and hurts small businesses without really improving access. One example, a small business, a minimarket in my district, went through a renovation. They put in a nice ramp there on the front of their business, a concrete structure that had been inspected, and they were working with the county all along. Then, when they were done, someone came and said: This is 1 degree off on incline.

How is a small business supposed to deal with issues like that when the regulators themselves can't even keep track of what they are supposed to be doing? This only benefits corrupt attorneys. That is why I support the ADA Education and Reform Act which will end this shady practice and give property owners a reasonable chance to fix potential issues.

COMMONSENSE GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, a person sends their child to school and expects that they are going to come home safely.

I am so sad for the grieving families of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland. Innocent children—gone in a blink. I am thankful for the first responders, but foremost, my thoughts are with the grieving families, the students, and the teachers affected by this horrific shooting.

We see this carnage over and over again. We know there is no magic solution, but that doesn't mean that there are no solutions. We need more resources for mental health, not tax cuts for billionaires. And, yes, Mr. President, are you listening? We need commonsense gun safety legislation, not these idiotic bills that expand gun usage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HANDEL). Members are reminded to please address their remarks to the Chair and not to a viewing audience.

CALLING FOR SENSIBLE GUN REFORM

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I do not rise today for another moment of silence for Parkland, Florida, for the semiautomatic weapon and shooter who wielded it already silenced 17 Floridians and injured countless others at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School.

Instead, I rise to make their voices heard. I rise to call for action on sensible gun reform. The Parkland shooter likely got his semiautomatic weapon through a private sale or a gun show without a background check, in spite of a record of mental health issues.

It is time to close that loophole. The Las Vegas shooter used a bump stock to convert a semiautomatic weapon into an automatic weapon—which is already illegal. Bump stocks should also be illegal.

Why is nothing happening? In my own home of Orlando, the shooter at the Pulse nightclub was on the FBI watch list. Imagine if we passed no fly, no buy and stopped that from happening.

Now is not the time for silence. Now is the time for action, and now is time for solutions.

□ 1230

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHRISTIANA DUARTE

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Christiana Duarte. Christiana attended the Route 91 Festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

She had recently graduated from the University of Arizona with a degree in business marketing. While in college, she interned with the Arizona Wildcats and was a member of the sorority Sigma Kappa. After graduation Christiana worked for the Los Angeles Kings as a fan services associate.

Friends and family remember Christiana as a bright, beautiful young woman who was full of life and energy.

I would like to extend my condolences to Christiana Duarte's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, a budget reflects one's values. President Trump's budget shows he values polluters and profits over people.

With the ink barely dry on the Republican tax scam, Trump's budget proposes we pay for their corporate giveaway by gutting public health and environmental programs.

One of the budget's largest targets is the EPA, which will suffer a 25 percent cut. This means cuts to grants that help States like California implement the Clean Air and Clean Water Act. That means cuts to Superfund programs that clean up sites where toxic chemicals from factories and landfills were dumped for decades, polluting the surrounding soil, water, and air.

We simply cannot afford a dirty budget that prioritizes polluters and profits over people.

AMERICAN SCHOOLCHILDREN ARE AT RISK

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, this House generally jumps into action once there has been a mass shooting by having a moment of silence. Today we didn't even have a moment of silence because the House knows that those are meaningless acts that don't have any effect on our schoolchildren who have been the victims of 18 school mass shootings this year.

It is shameful this Congress has not dealt with no fly, no buy. If you are on a terrorist list, you can still buy a gun.

It is a shame this Congress passed a law that takes away from individuals who get Social Security who may be mentally ill the ability to buy a gun.

We don't even have studies on what has been happening in trying to protect schoolchildren. It is a shame.

We need to act. American schoolchildren are at risk, and I am ashamed at what this Congress has failed to do: take action.

LET DEMOCRACY PREVAIL ON IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we have 4 legislative days before those protected by DACA will be at risk. The Speaker has said he was going to address this issue. He has not at this point in time.

The Speaker said on 9/23/2010: We will advance major legislation one issue at a time.

He said: We will not duck the tough issues. We will take them head-on.

In that light, I urge the Speaker to put on the floor the three bills that are pending in this House: a clean Dream Act; the USA Act, sponsored by Representatives AGUILAR and HURD, a bipartisan bill; and a Republican bill, the Securing America's Future Act, sponsored by Representative GOODLATTE.

Madam Speaker, let the people's House speak. Let them vote. Put these three bills on the floor, and let the majority rule. That is democracy. Let democracy prevail in this House.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Speaker, in June, seven American heroes died on a dark night when a ship collided with an American destroyer, the USS *Fitzgerald*. Among the dead were immigrants from Vietnam and the Philippines, as well as sons of workers who journeyed north from Guatemala.

As one of the sailors who survived explained: You are crammed in with all sorts of cultures on the ship, but when you are on the *Fitzgerald*, you are family.

Just like the *Fitzgerald*, my unit in Iraq included men of many races and religions. We were a family, too, and it made us stronger.

Madam Speaker, what is true of our military is also true of our country. Lots of nations have democratic institutions, plenty of countries have good schools, and all too many, as we know, wield powerful weapons; but what makes America great, what makes America powerful, and what makes America America is that, since our founding, we have thrown our doors open to the world, and we have kept them open to the strivers and the dreamers from every corner of the globe.

We didn't become the greatest, most powerful country in the world because we let in a certain group of people and then slammed the door behind them. No, Madam Speaker, we built this country by making America the only country in the world where anyone from anywhere can accomplish anything.

President Reagan may have summed it up best when he explained that:

You can go to Japan to live but you cannot become Japanese. You can go to France to live and not become a

Frenchman. Anyone can come to America to live and become an American.

Unfortunately, our current President and his friends in Congress want to turn their backs on what made America great. Their anti-immigrant agenda will lead to the deportation of millions and drastic cuts in legal immigration.

The last time Congress restricted immigration in this way was almost 100 years ago. Back then, conservatives were worried that there were too many Italians and Jews who were arriving on our shores. Now, they are concerned about Mexican, Nigerian, and Chinese immigrants. The rhetoric may have shifted, the targets may have changed, but it is the same kind of backward, un-American thinking that existed then.

The American people are too smart for this. We don't fear people who don't speak like us or look like us or even pray the way we do. Time and time again, we have rejected the racists and the nativists of this country. We have done it before, and we will do it again.

Madam Speaker, I don't have to look at the polls to tell you that there are a lot more Americans like Aaron Chamberlin from Phoenix than like Donald Trump.

Aaron is a restaurant owner in Phoenix. When he learned that a young prep chef named Suny Santana was undocumented, Aaron said Suny could stay as long as he found a way to fix his undocumented status.

Thankfully, Suny qualified for DACA. He worked hard and thrived. In fact, he did so well that Aaron offered to partner with him in opening his very own new restaurant in downtown Phoenix. But then, cruelly and without warning, President Trump terminated DACA and stripped away Suny's status, throwing his entire life into limbo.

Democrats are fighting for Dreamers like Suny and for businessowners like Aaron who believe in them.

We are also fighting for veterans like Miguel Perez of Chicago. Miguel has lived in this country since he was 8 years old. He served two tours in Afghanistan and suffers from PTSD as a result of his service. Unfortunately, as is too often the case with us, this led to problems with addiction. Miguel deserves our support. Instead, he is facing deportation.

As I speak, Miguel is currently sitting in an ICE detention center in Kenosha, Wisconsin, which happens to be in the district of our Speaker, PAUL RYAN.

Miguel isn't alone. Hundreds of immigrants who served our country in uniform could now be deported at the behest of a President who has never served one day in service to this country. These are men and women who took an oath to protect and defend this Nation. They have earned the right to call this country home. They have earned the right to call themselves Americans. To deport these brave men and women after they have fought under our flag dishonors the service of all of us who risked our lives for this country.

We must find a way to protect Dreamers and immigrant families, including brave immigrants who served in uniform. The American people are on our side. They know that Trump's fearful vision for our future is incompatible with who we are as Americans. They are proud to live in a country that attracts the brightest minds and the hardest workers from all around the world. They understand that exclusion and hate are the exact opposite of what makes America America.

This Nation did not become great by kicking out immigrants who fight hard like Miguel or who dream big like Suny. Unlike every other country on Earth, we aren't defined by where we come from, but we are defined by what we believe.

Donald Trump may not understand that, but the American people do.

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

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, it is a somber time to come into this Chamber as we have colleagues at the other end of the building who formed something they call the Common Sense Coalition, which is, I think, a gentle euphemism like so many things in this town are, which might well be called the ''kick the can down the road'' coalition, the ''doing the same thing again and again and again and again and expecting a different result'' coalition, or the ''those who do not learn from the past are doomed to repeat it'' coalition.

The photo that is to my left and to your right if you are viewing at home is of me at a ceremony at Red Hill Farm in the Fifth District of Virginia, where a man named Patrick Henry lived.

Patrick Henry is notable as an early patriot who sought to ensure the blessings of self-determination and liberty for a fledgling nation that determined that it was unjust that they should be governed by edict from across the sea and most notably said the words: ''I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death.''

Indeed, anyone who signed the Declaration of Independence understood at that time that they were literally signing their own death warrant, yet they did because it was the right thing to do.

Today we have degenerated into a political class that knows pandering and efforts to placate individuals without the interests of the mass constituency that we all unitedly serve, and that is the American people.

In fact, when Patrick Henry spoke about liberty one day in a separate speech, from the back of the room, someone shouted, ''Treason,'' and Henry responded eloquently: ''If this be treason, make the most of it.''

What has happened to our leaders?

So that day I spoke to a group of a couple of dozen new Americans from every corner of the world—from Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Europe, and South America—who had, in some instances, worked decades to become Americans and to earn those blessings of liberty gained for us by people like Patrick Henry, like 1 million nameless faces who died of combat death, disease, or starvation during a war to end the horrific institution of slavery, and like Abraham Lincoln and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

So they, indeed, looked like America—Brown people, White people, Black people, Asian people, American people—and they earned it. But what is coming out of the Senate now essentially throws aside the sacrifices of so many in order to score political points.

It was, indeed, one of the greatest honors of my life to welcome those new brothers and sisters to our American family. Yet the process through which they pained and labored does not in any way mirror the process that we would continue by kicking the can down the road under the proposed Senate ''compromise.''

I could really, literally, do this all day, all week, all month, and all year if I wanted to highlight the cases of individuals who had lost their lives because our Federal Government is completely unwilling to enforce the laws that it currently has on the books.

□ 1245

Many of you recognize the lovely face of Kate Steinle, who was enjoying a beautiful afternoon in the Embarcadero district of San Francisco on pier 14 with her dad. A graduate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, she worked in the medical field and had recently moved in with her boyfriend when an illegal who had been deported 5 times, who the local government refused to turn over to Federal authorities, discharged a weapon that he stole from a member of law enforcement at what he said was a sea lion—which is bad enough—and killed this lovely young woman whom her friends say loved yoga and helping others.

Reports indicate that among her last words was a plea to her father to please help. She passed away because we refuse to enforce our law.

Edwin Jackson, a linebacker for the Indianapolis Colts, was born in the same town that I was: Atlanta, Georgia. He didn't have big-time football offers out of high school. Indeed, instead of the University of Georgia or Florida or Clemson, he matriculated to Georgia Southern University. But he worked, and he worked with an optimism that radiated from the very smile on his face.

And not long ago, Edwin Jackson became one of nearly 1,000 people per year who die in alcohol-related accidents involving people in this country illegally; as well as his Uber driver, Jeffrey Monroe, who should also be noted. Edwin Jackson's obituary indicated that his greatest goal in life was to be a positive role model for young people to overcome challenges.

The individual who was detained had a blood alcohol content of .239, or nearly three times the legal limit. He had been deported twice before, tried to run from the scene, and lied to police officers about his name upon his apprehension.

Edwin Jackson and Jeffrey Monroe are dead because we refuse to enforce our laws.

Denise Mosier, in my home State of Virginia, in 2010, was riding in a van with two other nuns from the 33-women monastery where she made her home, aspiring to help people. Her two dear friends were horrifically injured in an accident that took Miss Mosier's life. This Benedictine nun had devoted her life to the service of others. Quite literally, you could find nothing bad that anyone could say about this woman.

The driver who took her life was ultimately charged with DUI third or subsequent offense. He had arrived illegally in this country and was only weeks away from a deportation hearing, which he was only having because of his multiple prior arrests for driving under the influence.

Tragically, our unwillingness to enforce our own laws cost about 10 percent of the community at the monastery where Denise Mosier made her home dearly and cost about 4 percent their life.

In fact, 13 percent of all drunk drivers arrested in the United States every year are here illegally—13 percent of 1.5 million. And the death toll of drunk-driving-related offenses in this country is about 10,000 per year. So extrapolating those numbers, nearly 1,000 people per year are killed in alcohol-related accidents involving those here illegally. And we refuse to enforce our own laws.

Peter Hacking was a volunteer fire department captain in Texas. One afternoon not long ago, Peter stopped off Highway 78 to pick up his children, which included 4-year-old Ellie and a son who was 2, when they were killed by a previously deported drunk driver, who ultimately received a sentence of about 2 years, and who was here because we will not secure our border and we will not enforce our laws.

Let me be clear: those two dozen or so individuals whom I had the great honor—of all faiths and all creeds from around the world—of welcoming into our American family are American just like everyone watching this today. But those who are not here legally, who will not go through the processes prescribed by this very body, are a discredit to those who work so hard and those who have sacrificed so much to make this Nation the beacon of freedom that it is. And no nation of laws can perpetuate itself so long as it looks the other way as its laws are selectively enforced and not enforced.

Tessa Tranchant, from Virginia Beach, Virginia, was riding with a girlfriend and killed by a drunk driver here illegally.

Danny Oliver and Michael Davis were law enforcement professionals from Sacramento, California. They were murdered by a frequently deported individual who swears that he will find a way to kill more police officers.

Dominic Durden was killed while riding his motorcycle by an illegal drunk driver.

Jamiel Shaw was brutally shot and murdered by an illegal.

Marilyn Pharis, who devoted her life to the service of this Nation in the United States Air Force, was beaten, tortured, raped, and murdered by an illegal who had been arrested 6 times in 15 months, the most recent time being 8 days before this crime was perpetrated but not reported to Federal authorities because the sanctuary community that she was in did not deem it worthy to report.

I want to see a healthy and robust immigration system into this country, legally. I want to live in a nation that enforces the very laws that these bodies pass to protect those people who we are tasked with serving, the American people, be they naturalized or native born.

I literally could keep telling these stories for weeks and weeks and weeks.

So we now find fiscal responsibility a rallying cry from individuals who don't seem to care about that at any point in time except for when it is convenient to their political agenda. We have a President in the White House who suggested that we would build a border wall and we would have those who are responsible for the immigration problem pay for it. We have a media that glowingly and gleefully pokes fun and asks: How is that plan going for you?

Well, I have a proposal. About 92 percent of foreign nationals in U.S. Federal prisons are here illegally. That is over 9 out of 10. That comes out to about 34,500 inmates in our Federal prison system here illegally. And they are not here for immigration violations. They are here for robbery; they are here for rape; they are here for murder.

The cost to incarcerate one individual in the Federal prison system annually is about $32,500. I'm not that good at math, but that comes out to about $1.1 billion per year. If you move away from the Federal prison system and extrapolate those numbers across the State prison systems, you are looking at something like $9.5 billion per year to incarcerate illegals here convicted of violent crimes, felonies. We are talking about prisons, not jails.

Now, the Senate plan says: Okay. Well, what we are going to do is we are going to spend $18 billion over 10 years.

I will tell you what. If we can just secure the Southern border and stop the inflow of illegals, we could reduce our Federal and State prison expenditures by about $9.5 billion a year, and I'll get you your $18 billion in 2 years.

In other words, you want to pay for this wall?

Build it; it will pay for itself. And that is in dollars and cents.

But, folks, how do you quantify the lives of these people?

How do you put a dollar value on the life of a woman who spent her entire life serving our country and was tortured, raped, and murdered by someone who had been arrested just 6 days before and, under the Federal law, should have been reported to Federal authorities, but they didn't think it was necessary in California?

Or Jamiel, is there a dollar value you can put on this young man's life?

How do you quantify these lives? How about these law enforcement professionals? How about this teenage girl from Virginia Beach, Virginia? How about a firefighter and father of a 22-month-old and a 4-year-old? How about a nun who devoted her entire life to serving others? How about a football player who worked his way up from the bottom and only wanted to motivate and inspire young people who faced challenging circumstances?

I genuinely love my brothers and sisters of all races, creeds, and origins; I genuinely do. I welcome them to apply to a process to allow them to avail themselves of the benefits of, I believe, the greatest Nation the Earth has ever seen. Winston Churchill said: ''Democracy was the worst form of government, except for all the others.'' This is the worst country in the world, except for all the others.

But if we won't enforce the laws that we pass, who are we? What have we become? And if we won't protect those people who protect us—firefighters, police officers, nuns, and mothers—how can we look at ourselves?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Virginia for yielding. I really thank him for his leadership on this issue.

The last time I spoke on this floor on immigration, I talked about three principles: One, Americans have the right to determine who becomes citizens through laws; two, the people who do come here should be in the best interest of American citizens; and three, that we have the right to enforce those choices.

The people who do come here should be in the best interest of American citizens. That is key. What we are doing now isn't there yet. We allow, today, one individual to get a green card. Then he is able to sponsor his immediate family and relatives. And then the relatives can sponsor their relatives. Then the relatives of those relatives can sponsor their relatives and so on, until there is no one in the family left to sponsor or no one left who

even wants to come to the United States.

Potentially, this could go on forever. This is called chain migration, and 65 percent of our green cards are awarded through this chain migration. That is about 700,000 people every year gaining permanent residence in our country through no other criteria than that they happen to be related to someone who lives here.

We have no idea whether these individuals are going to be economically successful. We have no idea whether they will contribute to our country. We don't even look at those characteristics for chain migration. The important question is who the immigrant is related to, not whether or not he might help America be a safer or a more prosperous country. Chain migration does not meet that key principle. American immigration should be in the best interest of Americans.

The Securing America's Future Act ends this chain migration. It stops it for everyone except the children and spouses of immigrants. But those relatives cannot bring in additional immigrants, so the chain is broken. The Securing America's Future Act, in turn, replaces those immigrants with skilled workers, workers who could help us build a better future.

I think about it this way: there are 150 million people around the world who would say that they would emigrate to the United States if they were just given the opportunity. What a great country. We could do what we do now and let those people enter on the basis of who they are related to. That is what we are doing. Or we could let in the best engineers, doctors, nurses, teachers, and businessmen. We can let in those who could speak English well, who know our system of government, who have gone to university. But that can only happen if we end chain migration.

The chain migration proposal in the Securing America's Future Act becomes even more crucial when we look at the DACA issue. If we allow DACA recipients to get some form of residency, past history tells us that they will potentially sponsor around 3½ immigrants each. That is a 2- to 3-million-person increase in the immigrant population. That is a huge incentive for future immigrants to come here illegally.

□ 1300

The notion that you will get to bring your whole family over here if you manage to enter illegally is part of what led to the 2013–2014 border crisis. When the previous administration was rumored to be granting amnesty, tens of thousands of Latin American families sent their minor children north.

It was a national emergency, and it overwhelmed the Border Patrol and the immigrant processing facilities there in the Southwest. We had to pass emergency appropriations just to process these individuals. Any DACA fix that does not also include additional border security and protections against those migrating this way, they could really see a similar crisis.

Madam Speaker, the Securing America's Future Act is an incredible piece of legislation. And while I have dwelt on its chain migration provisions—and there are many more worthy reforms—this bill cracks down on sanctuary cities, which my colleague mentioned earlier. It includes Kate's Law to toughen penalties against those who are deported, come back to the United States, and commit crimes. It includes mandatory E-Verify to crack down on businesses that break the law. It ends the diversity visa lottery, one of the most senseless Federal policies that I can think of.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his efforts on this; I thank Representative LABRADOR, one of our staunchest conservative leaders in the House, for his leadership in crafting this bill; and I thank Representative GARRETT for organizing this opportunity to discuss the bill.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative BUDD for his comments.

At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my good colleague from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) and everybody else who has participated in this important topic.

For far too long, Washington has allowed our broken immigration system to fester. Since 1986, when safeguards were put in place to protect our Nation from illegal immigration, we have seen the rule of law not followed, and it has led to the situation we have today. This is not an overnight sensation that just has happened.

If you look at the number one role of government, it is to provide for the common defense of our Nation and the security of our Nation. Madam Speaker, you cannot have a secure nation if you don't have secure borders. That is one of the reasons we lock our car doors. That is one of the reasons we lock our house doors is to secure our family.

Well, the government's role is to secure their Nation and the people within it so that we can have a secure nation, the peace of mind that our families are protected from people that shouldn't be here in the first place. We need to reform our system so that we have legal immigration that is not burdensome to the point where it doesn't work, and that is what Washington has been well known for. We need to seek real reforms that cut down on illegal immigration while protecting and bolstering the legal immigration system.

Our Nation is a nation of immigrants, and Theodore Roosevelt addressed this, I think, very succinctly in 1907 in a speech when he talked about our land being a land of immigrants, how we have come over from other countries from around the world. But he also went on to say and talk about the values of America, that we, being a land of immigrants, understand this: There is but room for one flag. It is the American flag. You need to honor it. There is room but for one language. It is English. You need to learn it.

Immigration without assimilation is an invasion, and that is really what we have, an invasion, because we don't know who is here. We don't know where they came from.

And Dreamers who were brought here to this country, I think we are all sympathetic. They were brought here to this country at no fault of their own and registered with DHS under DACA. There is a program where they could have registered. They are a different class, but they can be handled in a systematic manner, whether it starts off with probationary periods, running background checks, ensuring all fines are paid for outstanding traffic tickets or other, among other things. And I stand with and I am a cosponsor of the Goodlatte-Labrador bill. I think it is a great start. As immigration policies or as policies up here in Washington, we know they change over time, and so I think this is a good start.

We need to strengthen our border—that needs to be paramount—and tighten our borders through what the Customs and Border Patrol tell us to do.

You know, there are people who want to build a wall from sea to shining sea. I think we should build a wall where the experts say we need to build a wall and do other forms of security, but the bottom line is we have to have a secure border. And it is not just our southwest border; it is all of our borders. And I think every American should be concerned about this, and you would think they would want this.

We also should allow Customs and Border Patrol to survey and make recommendations for how they think best we can increase the security of, again, not just our southern border but, again, all the borders.

Sanctuary cities who openly defy Federal immigration law place American citizens at risk, and I would hope the people in those cities, the citizens of those cities, would rise up and hold their elected officials accountable so that it is not a political platform that a party wants to promote. All you have to do is look at the many people who have been killed by people here illegally, and they rush for the protection of a sanctuary city.

And these are cities, again, that are breaking the Federal law. They defy Federal law without consequence. Congress does have the power to hold these people accountable, these States. And, again, it will be the citizens of those cities, hopefully, who will rise up and say enough is enough.

The Goodlatte-Labrador bill, H.R. 4760, the Securing America's Future Act, I cosponsored because it lays out a plan to address many of the immigration reform priorities: It eliminates the diversity visa, which is just a happenstance. If you are the lucky one

who pulls the right number, you get the lottery ticket, and the lottery ticket is coming here to America. It eliminates the diversity visa to increase the number of skilled worker visas. It creates a new agriculture guest worker program.

And I am proud because some of the recommendations we have are in that bill, and so we want to see that pass. This is one of the things that has to happen.

But before we can go forward, we have to make sure that the borders are secured, that the rule of law is enforced, and that we have a good guest worker program. It also requires employers to utilize the E-Verify system to ensure their employees are legally able to work in this country.

The good thing about the E-Verify system, it also gives protection to the employer, knowing that they went through the process that the government says they must go through and they have hired people that the government says are okay. So it gives protection not just to our employers, but it gives protection to the people here, who come here for the privilege of coming to America to work.

It invests in a new security measure for our borders, gives registered DACA recipients a renewable 3-year legal status, while ensuring individuals who could cause harm are not eligible for it. It withholds grants and Federal funding from sanctuary cities and gets rid of the chain migration.

So this, I think, is a very strong bill. I think it is a very good bill, that it accomplishes the goal. It could always be better. It is not comprehensive immigration reform, but it is a great start.

You know, working in the agricultural sector for 35 years of my life as a veterinarian working on the farms, I talked to a lot of the immigrants, and a lot of the immigrants that I talked to were here illegally. And I asked them: Do you want to be a citizen of the United States?

They said: No. The majority of them didn't. They wanted the opportunity—the opportunity—to come here to make some money to go back home, and I think we should accommodate that.

And then if you talk to other immigrants who are here and they migrated here legally, I asked them: Why did you come here? Why did your parents come here?

And do you know what it always comes down to? They wanted opportunity, and they wanted security, and they wanted a better life for their family.

So our broken system does not accomplish that, and it is time to fix the broken system, and this is the time to do it.

With that, I thank the gentleman for bringing up this great topic, this passionate topic, and with your work, your help, we can accomplish this.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), my friend and colleague, for his comments.

In 42 years, 3,037 Americans have been killed on U.S. soil by foreign-born terrorists. There have been 182 foreign-born terrorists, to be precise, who have taken the lives of almost 3,050 Americans, and 63 of those 182, or greater than a third, came here legally on visas, to include the diversity visa scheme. In fact, our office has tried relatively diligently to calculate the actual death toll of native-born Americans by recipients of diversity visas, unsuccessfully. These are difficult data points.

But just in the last few years, the name Sayfullo Saipov has been in the American news. This jihadist who had an admiration for terrorists, to include the murderous raping, intolerant thugs of ISIS, took the lives of eight Americans and injured many more in a truck attack on Halloween, just last October. He was the recipient of a diversity lottery visa.

Before that, Abdurasul Hasanovich Juraboev from Uzbekistan was also the recipient of a diversity lottery visa, and he was arrested in 2015 for conspiring to ''kill as many Americans as he could.'' He wrote:

> I am in the USA now. We don't have the weapons we need. Is it possible to commit ourselves as dedicated martyrs anyway while here? What I am saying is, to get guns, to shoot Obama, and then maybe get shot ourselves. Would that do? That would strike fear into the hearts of the infidels.

This legal diversity visa recipient from Brooklyn said:

> If this is not successful, maybe bomb Coney Island.

Fortunately, he was arrested before he could bring to fruition his plans to assault individuals in the very Nation that had so graciously opened its doors.

It is incredibly interesting to me the results that I learned when my wife and I engaged in that which is all the rage these days and looked at our DNA. I found out I had relatives from multiple continents, and I am proud of that. But I am an American just like those people who stood with me that day at the home of the great American patriot Patrick Henry, from Africa and Asia, the Middle East, South America, Europe, Oceania. They are my American brothers and sisters. They did everything by the numbers and availed themselves of a dream that we all share. Those who do not, cheapen the sacrifice made by so many who have come before them.

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

SUCCEEDING ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate that, and I appreciate you being here with us on a Thursday afternoon.

I know that you came to Congress with the same optimism that I came to Congress with, and that is, if only we work hard enough together, if only we commit ourselves with earnestness to one another, we will be able to make a difference for folks. I still believe that, and I hope you still believe that, too, after your time here.

I still believe that, if only we work hard enough, we are going to be able to serve the American people as we promised we would. But occasionally—occasionally—I don't want to vilify the entire fourth estate today, Madam Speaker. There is not enough time to go through that today. But occasionally, the fourth estate seems to suggest that we are failing the American people when, in fact, we are succeeding on their behalf, and that is what I want to talk about this afternoon.

We just came through a difficult budget time, Madam Speaker. We came through that not because of any failures of any man or woman in this institution. I want to make that clear. This House came together as a body back in July of last year and passed every single national security appropriations bill that was upon us.

□ 1315

July of last year—3 months before the end of the fiscal year—this body came together and did its job to fund our men and women in uniform, fund border security, and fund those incredibly important national security items that every single American family cares about.

The Senate had been unable to get any of those bills passed. That brought us to just a week ago, when the President finally signed into law a funding bill for the United States Government to cover the remainder of fiscal year 2018.

I mentioned the House passed, in July of last year, all of the national security appropriations bills. In September of last year, Madam Speaker, the House passed all the rest of the appropriations bills. So the entire Federal Government, from the perspective of the 435 men and women who serve in the House, that work was completed on time before the end of the fiscal year.

But, again, the Senate was unable to take up any appropriations bills, for a variety of different reasons—and I am not interested in assigning that blame today. I am interested in figuring out what we can do about it going forward—took until just a week ago for the Senate to sign an appropriations bill, craft a plan, and do what we call raising the caps so that we can get a funding agreement that will take us over the next 18 months.

Madam Speaker, you can't see it here, but I have a chart of defense spending going back over the last few years. In fact, I started the chart the year that I was running for Congress for the very first time. It was 2010. I came in in that big class of freshmen. There were 100 of us. Imagine that: 100

out of 435 Members, coming in for the first time, together, in January of 2011, and many of us came here with a desire to balance budgets.

Among the many data points that get shared, Madam Speaker, one was shared with me when I was doing C–SPAN's Washington Journal this week. The host said: ROB, do you think the era of fiscal conservatism is over?

I thought that was odd. I am thinking: No, I serve in a body full of men and women, both sides of the aisle, fiscal conservatives, who want to make sure the American taxpayer is getting a dollar's worth of value for a dollar's worth of taxes, who want to make sure we are not balancing the budget on the backs of our children and grandchildren, and who want to make sure we are not mortgaging the future of our children and our grandchildren.

Why would the era of fiscal conservatism be over? Well, the suggestion was made it is because we just signed a budget deal, and that budget deal raises levels of discretionary spending in this country; and if we are raising levels of discretionary spending, mustn't that mean that our commitment to fiscal responsibility is over?

That led me to come to the floor today, Madam Speaker, because what you can't see on this chart, but I have displayed here, are two lines. One is a red line. Oftentimes, Madam Speaker, folks bring charts to the floor that only show you a part of the picture, so the amplitude is exaggerated. It looks like things are worse or better than they actually are.

I have grounded my chart at zero. This is zero dollars in spending, going all the way up to $1 trillion in spending. The year I got here, we were spending about $689 billion a year on defense.

Well, we got together as a body, Madam Speaker. And, I will remind you, Republicans controlled the U.S. House at that time. President Obama controlled the White House, Harry Reid controlled the United States Senate, and the House was in minority hands, being led by Republicans. But we got together, Republicans and Democrats—House, Senate, White House—and we crafted a budget plan forward that reduced spending.

Now, the plan was that we were going to reduce spending on both the defense side of the ledger and the nondefense side of the ledger, and then we were going to come together and deal with those major healthcare entitlement programs that are driving the debt far out into the future, deal with the trust funds for Medicare and Social Security that are underfunded today that cannot sustain the promises that have been made to generations today, that we would repair those programs and make them solvent long into the future.

It was a worthwhile goal. It was a goal worthy of this body, men and women—Republicans, Democrats, House Members, Senate Members—who came together. But what you can see on this chart, Madam Speaker, is the black line indicates the path we took of funding national security, each year, spending less and less and less.

Now, mind you, nobody thought this was the right plan for how to fund national security. This was designed to be a driver to force folks to come together and deal with those larger entitlement programs that actually are the drivers of the debt. It didn't work.

In fact, we had an entire Presidential election cycle that just went on 15 months ago, Madam Speaker, where you can't name the candidate who ran on either the Republican or the Democratic side of the aisle, who made debt and deficits their priority.

Who was that? Who was that leader running for the White House, the last time around, who focused on debt and deficits as their priorities? For whatever reason, it slipped from the national stage, probably because we had been successfully curbing the needle on spending.

So, fast forward, to just a week ago, Madam Speaker, where we raised defense spending by $100 billion a year. Now, if you calculate where the caps were going to go and how the sequester was going to happen, you actually turn out to have about a $150 billion increase over where folks expected us to be.

Well, golly, Madam Speaker, even in Washington, D.C., when you raise a $550 billion budget to $700 billion, that is an enormous increase. That is why I was asked: Is the era of fiscal conservatism over?

I direct you to this chart, I show you this enormous increase in defense spending, and I show you that we are still $100 billion a year lower than Barack Obama, NANCY PELOSI, and Harry Reid had anticipated before I was elected to Congress in 2010.

All of this area, between the red line and the black line, Madam Speaker, are dollars saved for the American people. Now, those dollars came at a price.

I reference testimony that Defense Secretary Jim Mattis, former General Jim Mattis, gave in the Armed Services Committee—this was just a week and 2 days ago—and he said this: ''I cannot overstate the impact to our troops' morale from all this uncertainty.''

He is talking about these continuing resolutions that get passed. Again, the House passed its bills back last July, the Senate hasn't been able to pass any of its bills, so we were funding the government one short-term bill at the time, creating havoc on the American military.

''I cannot overstate the impact to our troops' morale from all this uncertainty. The combination of rapidly changing technology, the negative impact on military readiness resulting from the longest continuous stretch of combat in our Nation's history, and insufficient funding have created an overstretched and underresourced military.''

I don't believe there is a man or woman in this Chamber, Madam Speaker, who would disagree with that, ''an overstretched and underresourced military,'' or ''the longest continuous stretch of combat in our Nation's history.'' This is not an issue that divides this Chamber, this is an issue that unites this Chamber, Madam Speaker. I am proud that we came together, as a House and a Senate, as Republicans and Democrats, to address that failure.

In fact, I will quote from General Mattis. Just two days after that morale quote, after this body had acted, after the Senate had finally acted, after the President had put his signature on the bill, General Mattis said this: ''I am very confident that what the Congress has now done and the President is going to allocate to us in the budget is what we need to bring us back to a position of primacy.''

''What the Congress has done and what the President will allocate will bring us back to a position of primacy,'' I mention that again, Madam Speaker, because, among the many conversations we have here about military readiness, General Mattis has expressed confidence that, in a time of war, the Congress would fund the military.

In fact, in that same testimony that I quoted from earlier before the Armed Services Committee, he said: ''I know that in time of a major war, Congress will provide our military with what it needs. But money at the time of crisis fails to deter war. . . .''

I know the Congress will provide what we need in a time of crisis, but money at a time of crisis fails to deter that crisis. We could have avoided that conflict had only we been properly funded.

We came together with White House leadership. The President said: I need $700 billion for 2018; I need $716 billion for 2019. That is what General Mattis said as well. That is what we are hearing from the entire administration. That is what we came together and gave.

But the era of fiscal conservatism, Madam Speaker, is not over. The era of shortchanging our military, in the hopes that we might come together on a bigger deal, the gridlock that was created by that, that gridlock is over. That uncertainty that General Mattis bemoaned, that is over. But fiscal conservatism continues.

It is not just on the defense side. It is easy to talk about the defense side because I know that is something that unites everyone in the Chamber, Madam Speaker. But let's look at the nondefense side.

Nondefense, as you know, Madam Speaker, is, well, everything else that the Federal Government does—it is not an income support program—from parks to roads to courts, from prisons to education, from investments in NIH and the CDC, from our involvement overseas in hunger programs and refugee programs. Absolutely everything

else the Federal Government does is in the nondefense discretionary side.

I point you to two lines, once again, Madam Speaker. The red line is what President Obama, Speaker PELOSI, AND MAJORITY LEADER HARRY REID ANTICIPATED SPENDING BEFORE I ARRIVED. THE BLACK LINE IS WHAT WE HAVE ACTUALLY SPENT SINCE I ARRIVED.

Among the many changes made in the law, when the President signed the caps deals into effect last week, is that we raised nondefense discretionary spending, too. In fact, over the 2-year deal that the President signed, we are talking about an additional $300 billion—billion with a B—in additional spending.

Well, by golly, Madam Speaker, if you care about budgets, if you care about deficits, isn't $300 billion a frighteningly large figure to increase spending in a time of already existing deficits? Of course, it is. Of course, it is.

But let me say, once again, that does not mean the era of fiscal conservatism is over. We had a choice. We could continue to keep the military in that space of uncertainty that General Mattis cited as being so dangerous, or we could cut the deal that we had to cut to break that cycle of uncertainty.

I don't know what kind of negotiating experience you have had, Madam Speaker, but it turns out that when you walk into a negotiation and say, ''I have got to have what I have got to have, and I will give you whatever you need in order to get it,'' you are not in a particularly strong negotiating spot.

That is the position the President found himself in. He was 100 percent committed to our troops, he was 100 percent committed to national security, he was 100 percent committed to that pay raise that we had promised our troops, but we had not funded, and he said: I am going to do whatever it takes to get $700 billion in 2018 and $716 billion in 2019, to make sure national security is protected and our troops are served.

Well, what that led to was an increase in nondefense discretionary spending as well, Madam Speaker. But still look at these lines. That delta between the top line of where we were going to go and the black line of where we have actually gone is trillions of dollars'—trillions with a T—worth of savings.

Between the defense spending, Madam Speaker, which changed dramatically after that big freshman class in 2011 arrived, and nondefense spending, which changed dramatically after that big class in 2011 arrived, trillions of dollars in debt has not occurred. Trillions of dollars in spending of American taxpayer dollars has not occurred.

We have squeezed those budgets: the security budget and the nonsecurity budget, the defense budget and the nondefense budget. We have squeezed each of those budgets to make sure that we are getting a dollar's worth of value for the American taxpayer out of every dollar that we spend.

The net result of that, Madam Speaker—that and a collection of economic outcomes that have been desirable—has led to a decrease in net interest spending: money that was not borrowed, interest that does not have to be paid—money that was not borrowed. Thus it didn't drive interest rates up. Those interest rates are lower on all the other money that has already been borrowed, not just trillions of dollars in savings on spending that was foregone, Madam Speaker, but trillions of dollars in savings of interest that was not paid.

□ 1330

Why do I take the time to come down to the floor to tell that story, Mr. Speaker?

It is because I grow weary, as I know all of my colleagues do, of reading the defeatist headlines that show up on the paper day after day after day: Congress failing; gridlock prevailing; bipartisanship dead; cooperation extinct.

It is not true.

What we have done together is worth bragging about back home. What we have done together is worth celebrating when we are together. What we have done together is worth using as a model for thinking about what we can do together again tomorrow.

It doesn't matter whether you sit on the furthest right in this Chamber or the furthest left in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. That dollar worth of taxes raised from that American citizen is a valuable thing. It is a trust. There is a stewardship obligation to each and every one of those dollars.

What do you want to use it for?

Maybe you want to give it back to those American citizens. I am particularly pleased with the tax bill we passed that did exactly that. Again, passed it in the House, passed it in the Senate, moved it to the White House; done in a bicameral way.

I think the American citizen can generally spend their dollar better than we can spend it on their behalf. I know they trust themselves to spend their dollar more than they trust us to spend it on their behalf.

We could take that dollar, we could put it back in an American citizen's pocket. Leave it with them to begin with and never even take it. That is what we did with the tax cuts.

We could invest that dollar in national security. We could look to see what is that additional training an airman might need; what is that additional equipment that a marine might need; what is that additional item that we could research, purchase, improve, repair, that would make a difference in the life of a man or a woman who is serving this country.

We could spend that dollar on national security. We could spend that dollar on nondefense needs; research in Alzheimer's; research at our major universities; research into that next generational transportation outcome that is going to change the way that we deal with congestion in America.

There are 1,000 different ways to spend each and every one of those dollars. It does not matter where you believe that dollar ought to go. It is a worthwhile purchase to make sure we are using that dollar, either with the American citizen in their pocket, with the DOD in the pursuit of national security, or with one of our great research institutions in pursuit of the next healthcare discovery, rather than paying it in interest to someone around the globe who lent us money in our time of need.

We need to restrain those dollars today, Mr. Speaker, so that when we have a time of need in the future, we will be able to access them. The era of fiscal responsibility is not behind us; it is upon us.

We have an opportunity each and every day together to squeeze those dollars until they scream; squeeze the value out of every nickel that comes through this institution. We have done it together, Mr. Speaker.

This isn't an aspirational goal. This is a certain fact, that we have done it together year after year after year after year. This isn't something that maybe one day, if only we work hard enough, we can do. This is something we have achieved year after year after year after year.

Let's not stop. Let's not stop. And let's not let folks tell us that we can't get it done together. Let's not give in to that devil on the left shoulder that says we should go down and run each other out and talk about why the institution fails.

Let's give in to that angel on the right shoulder that talks about how, if we put our minds together, if we commit ourselves to one another, there is genuinely no limit to what we can do together.

I am not just talking about what we can do together as the body here in the United States House, Mr. Speaker. And I am not just talking about what we can do together as a House and a Senate and a White House. I am talking about what we can do together as the American people.

The strength of this institution has never been the 435 Members who are in it. It has been the 300 million Americans who have sent us here. The strength of this institution has never come from the Members. It has come from the Nation that lends us its power.

I genuinely believe there is no limit to what we can do together. I am genuinely disappointed in those days that we give in to that devil on the left shoulder that tells us that running each other out, running each other down, denigrating the institution, denigrating the Nation, denigrating one another is the pathway to success.

But we have had enough victories together. We have come through enough challenges together. When they said we

would fail, we have succeeded together enough that I have great optimism not just about the next 10 months in this Chamber, but about the next decade, the next generation, the next hundred years for this country.

We don't know when the economy is going to fail us, Mr. Speaker. We have to plan for that rainy day. We have been doing that. We have been doing it with spending at every single level in the government, and it has made the biggest difference in debt and deficits that I have seen in my lifetime.

Let's build on that success. Let's recommit ourselves to that goal. Let's surprise the naysayers about the things that we do together.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 16, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4009. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4010. A letter from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's Fiscal Year 2016 FAIR Act Inventory, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4011. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting one action on nomination, and one discontinuation of service in acting role, 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.

4012. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's draft bill, titled the ''Reclamation Title Transfer Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4013. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31168; Amdt. No.: 3777] received February 14, 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.

4014. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31169; Amdt. No.: 3778] received February 14, 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.

4015. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31170; Amdt. No.: 3779] received February 14, 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.

4016. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31171; Amdt. No.: 3780] received February 14, 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.

4017. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenwood/Wonder Lake, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0459; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-14] received February 14, 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.

4018. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Eaton Rapids, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0209; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-9] received February 14, 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.

4019. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Truckee, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0565; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-1] received February 14, 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.

4020. 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-2017-0807; Product Identifier 2017-NM-080-AD; Amendment 39-19126; AD 2017-25-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 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.

4021. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0627; Product Identifier 2017-NM-037-AD; Amendment 39-19127; AD 2017-25-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 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.

4022. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0513; Product Identifier 2016-NM-152-AD; Amendment 39-19125; AD 2017-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 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.

4023. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR — GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1170; Product Identifier 2013-NM-054-AD; Amendment 39-19129; AD 2017-25-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 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.

4024. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1173; Product Identifier 2017-SW-030-AD; Amendment 39-19131; AD 2017-25-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 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.

4025. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0671; Product Identifier 2016-SW-072-AD; Amendment 39-19135; AD 2017-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 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.

4026. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Enstrom Helicopter Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1191; Product Identifier 2017-SW-046-AD; Amendment 39-19134; AD 2017-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 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.

4027. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0910; Product Identifier 2017-CE-027-AD; Amendment 39-19136; AD 2017-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 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.

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. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 717. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require review of the economic cost of adding a species to the list of endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–560). Referred to Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1274. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require making available to States affected by determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species all data that is the basis of such determinations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2603. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that nonnative species in the United States shall not be treated as endangered species or threatened species for purposes of that Act; with an amendment (Rept. 115–562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3131. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to conform citizen suits under that Act with other existing law, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–563, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3225. A bill to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands (Rept. 115–564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3607. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish fees for medical services provided in units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3131 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 5030. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for technical assistance for small treatment works; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. FASO, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 5031. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to provide for prize competitions relating to climate and energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5032. A bill to establish a pilot toll credit marketplace program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5033. A bill to set aside certain funds for supplementary safety measures and alternative safety measures for railway-highway grade crossings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HECK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 5034. A bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 5035. A bill to require the President to determine whether Hezbollah should be designated as a significant foreign narcotics trafficker or a transnational criminal organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 5036. A bill to establish an Independent Financial Technology Task Force, to provide rewards for information leading to convictions related to terrorist use of digital currencies, to establish a FinTech Leadership in Innovation Program to encourage the development of tools and programs to combat terrorist and illicit use of digital currencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Mr. DAVIDSON, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 5037. A bill to provide for exclusive Federal jurisdiction over civil securities fraud actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 5038. A bill to amend titles 5, 10, and 37 of the United States Code to ensure that an order to serve on active duty under section 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services for certain benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. BANKS of Indiana (for himself and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 5039. A bill to designate the National Airmail Museum at Smith Air Field in Fort Wayne, Indiana; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROYCE of California (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 5040. A bill to authorize the President to control the export, reexport, and transfer of commodities, software, and technology to protect the national security, and to promote the foreign policy, of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. WALBERG (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 5041. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to authorize the employees of a hospice program to handle controlled substances in the residence of a deceased hospice patient to assist in disposal; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 5042. A bill to establish the Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program at the Department of Energy to provide financial assistance to promote energy efficiency and onsite renewable technologies in manufacturing facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5043. A bill to permit expungement of records of certain nonviolent criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 5044. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the treatment of certain surviving spouses under the contracting goals and preferences of Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 5045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate overpayments of tax as contributions and to make additional contributions to the Stop Homelessness Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means,

and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 5046. A bill to provide that none of the funds made available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for any fiscal year may be used to carry out section 7 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5047. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a demonstration program to provide expanded access to medical services through partnerships between Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers and Federally qualified health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOST (for himself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 5048. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 with respect to eligibility to become a third-party provider, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 5049. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that each member of the Armed Forces who is discharged or separated from the Armed Forces receives documentation regarding the training and experience of the member; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5050. A bill to direct the Attorney General, in enforcing the provisions of the Controlled Substances Act relating to marijuana, to focus on certain enforcement priorities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 5051. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to revise the shareholder threshold for registration under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. GABBARD, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 5052. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for patient protection by establishing safe nurse staffing levels at certain Medicare providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 5053. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support innovative technology partnerships; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 5054. A bill to provide an exemption for emerging growth companies and other smaller companies from the requirements to use Extensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL) for financial statements and other periodic reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 5055. A bill to amend the Food Security amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to make acequias eligible for assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 5056. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inventory Confederate commemorative works on certain Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, 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 Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 5057. A bill to amend the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 to limit access to classified information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CORREA, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HECK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 5058. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the annual numerical limitation on U visas, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to grant work authorization to aliens with a pending application for nonimmigrant status under subparagraph (U) or (T) of section 101(a)(15) of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 5059. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act with respect to the registration and supervision of insurance savings and loan holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 5060. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make reforms to the benefits for Public Service Officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 5061. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to limit recovery for certain injuries incurred in shellfish aquaculture activities if a remedy is available; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 5062. A bill to provide for a study by the National Academy of Medicine on the use of genetic and genomic testing to improve health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5063. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10565 Steuben Street in Remsen, New York, as the ''Erin Hamlin Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5064. A bill to authorize aboriginal subsistence whaling pursuant to the regulations of the International Whaling Commission and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 5065. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that individuals who naturalized under title III of that Act, who are affiliated with a criminal gang, are subject to revocation of citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. TONKO):

H. Res. 739. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Engineers Week; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H. Res. 740. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 3, 2018, as World Hearing Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 5030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, General Welfare Clause

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Sec. 8.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Sec.8.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 5034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 7

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 5035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, providing the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.''

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 5036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, providing the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.''

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 5037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 5038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 5039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mr. ROYCE of California:

H.R. 5040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, including Clause 18 of that Section.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5042.

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 Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 5044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 5045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution

''All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 5046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 5047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the United State Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 5048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Article Section I of the United States Consititution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purpose in taxing and spending.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 5049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 5050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 5051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 5052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 5053.

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 Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 5054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 5055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 5056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Necessary and Proper Clause

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Needful Rules Clause

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 5058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 5059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, relating to the general welfare of the United States; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 5061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 which deals with interstate commerce.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 5062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 8

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 5065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 233: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 754: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 846: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 850: Mr. HARPER, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 878: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 967: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1267: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1529: Mr. YOHO and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1553: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1612: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 1651: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1683: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1832: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1903: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1972: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2133: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 2215: Ms. MOORE and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 2309: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2318: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2327: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2380: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2472: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2478: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2633: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2670: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2710: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2740: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2840: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2862: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 2952: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2957: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 2991: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 3197: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3356: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3459: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3530: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3586: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 3642: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 3738: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3742: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4044: Mr. JONES, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. COLE, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 4147: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 4207: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 4240: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 4256: Mr. NUNES, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 4274: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 4296: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4548: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4549: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 4556: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4575: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4659: Mr. EMMER and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4688: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4706: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4760: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 4770: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 4820: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 4827: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4844: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 4869: Mrs. RADEWAGEN and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 4884: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 4897: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 4912: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4919: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 4932: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4954: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4977: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4980: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4981: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 4982: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4995: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 5001: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5012: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 5013: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.J. Res. 32: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. COLE and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 188: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H. Res. 244: Mr. ISSA.
H. Res. 274: Mr. KIHUEN.
H. Res. 621: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 652: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H. Res. 699: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 707: Mr. GOMEZ.
H. Res. 720: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SANFORD.
H. Res. 728: Mr. DUNN.
H. Res. 737: Mrs. HARTZLER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

80. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, to express the firm and unequivocal repudiation and opposition of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico to HR 4202 of the United States House of Representatives that proposes the application of the ''Animal Welfare Act'' to United States territories and, consequently, prohibits cockfights in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

81. Also, a petition of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, to request the United States Congress and the United States Department of the Interior to take the necessary administrative and legislative actions in order to provide for the updating of various topographic and hydrographic maps of our Island; and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2018 No. 30

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ROY BLUNT, a Senator from the State of Missouri.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, thank You for Your mighty love. Today, empower our Senators to pass the test You permit them to experience. Give them the wisdom to believe that You will not permit them to be tested beyond their ability to prevail. Lord, provide them with a path of escape from life's vicissitudes. Help them to strive to be faithful servants of Your Kingdom, thereby leaving behind a legacy that will bless generations yet unborn. Use them for Your glory. And, Lord, sustain those who are dealing with the Parkland, FL, school shooting.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 15, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ROY BLUNT, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BLUNT thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

BROADER OPTIONS FOR AMERICANS ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2579, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2579) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

Pending:

Grassley amendment No. 1959, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for TOOMEY/CRUZ) amendment No. 1948 (to amendment No. 1959), to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States.

Schumer modified amendment No. 1958 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1959), of a perfecting nature.

Durbin (for COONS/MCCAIN) amendment No. 1955 (to amendment No. 1958), to provide relief from removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States before reaching the age of 18, improve border security, foster United States engagement in Central America.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

PARKLAND, FLORIDA, SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to begin this morning by sharing the shock and sorrow that all of us in this body felt as we learned of yesterday's shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL. To say that such brutal, pointless violence is unconscionable is an understatement. Schools should be places where children can learn, and faculty and staff can work without fear of violence.

My colleagues from Florida will carry home the prayers of the whole Senate for victims and their families, for the community of Parkland, and for the first responders who bravely charged into harm's way on behalf of others.

For the information of all Senators, the Senate will observe a moment of silence at 12 noon.

Now, Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, the entire week has been set aside, as I assured it would be, for votes on the DACA issue, border security, and other issues pertaining to the subject of immigration. At this point, we should be wrapping up a lively week of debate, amendments, and numerous votes, but that is not what has happened. Instead, we are here on Thursday morning and have yet to vote on a single amendment—not one amendment all week on what was offered: an open debate.

Remember, our Democratic friends wanted this debate. They actually shut down the Federal Government for 300 million Americans, unnecessarily, to guarantee that we could have this debate and at this particular time—this week.

They have spent months insisting that DACA is a top priority for them

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

Printed on recycled paper.

and telling their constituents they would do everything they could to resolve it. But when the rubber meets the road, they have yet to bring forward a single proposal that gives us a realistic chance to make law; that is, to pass the Senate, pass the House, and earn the President's signature. All they have done so far is to slow the process as much as possible. It turns out that they didn't want a fair, open, free-wheeling amendment process after all.

Yesterday evening, I filed cloture on all four pending amendments. At a minimum, under regular order, we could make sure that at least they receive a vote by Friday morning. I hope the Democratic leader will finally consent to hold these votes on amendments today.

Our Democratic friends say they want resolution for illegal immigrants who were brought into the country as children. The President put forward a framework that would do exactly that. His reasonable proposal offers a more than generous resolution for 1.8 million individuals in that category.

But the DACA issue is just a symptom of our broken immigration system. So the President has made clear, and I strongly agree, that any legislation must also treat the root causes and reform legal immigration, and it must also include commonsense steps to ensure the safety of the American people.

Several Senators, led by Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, have crafted legislation that accommodates the major interests of all sides. It fulfills the stated goals of our Democratic colleagues and—and—conforms to the President's requirements.

Their bill provides funding to secure the border. It reforms extended chain migration and the visa lottery program. It fixes the loophole that forces us to release thousands of criminal aliens who were rejected by their own home countries. It enacts Kate's Law to put criminals who illegally and repeatedly cross our borders behind bars. It gets tougher on violent and dangerous criminals such as drug smugglers, human traffickers, repeat drunk drivers, gang members, and sex offenders. And, yes, it offers a generous—extremely generous—resolution to the DACA issue.

The President, in my view, has gone more than half way to meet the Democrats and resolve this matter. If they are actually interested in finding a solution, it is time they take yes for an answer so that 1.8 million people are eligible for citizenship.

Because my Democratic friends were stalling for time, they spent 3 full days making political points instead of making law. I hope today can be different.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on a final subject, it has only been 55 days since the President signed historic tax reform into law. Already, it has led to bonuses, raises, and new benefits for millions of American workers, and the long-term signs are just as promising. Hundreds of companies have announced significant commitments to plant deeper roots in the American economy.

We know the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is pro-worker and pro-business, but tax reform is also, at its core, pro-family. It doubles the standard deduction, meaning a young married couple effectively gets a new zero-percent tax bracket for the first $24,000 they earn. If that couple decides to purchase a home, their mortgage interest will be eligible for a deduction. Contrary to what many predicted, the historic tax cuts we delivered didn't jeopardize the middle-class deduction. We preserved it.

When that couple starts a family, they will benefit from the fact that we doubled the child tax credit, thanks to the fine work of Senator HELLER and others throughout the committee process.

At its new level, that credit will save a two-child household $4,000 every year—$4,000—to help them with back-to-school costs, to kick off a college fund, or to help them afford summer camp tuition and a family vacation instead of choosing one or the other.

Thanks to the tireless work of my colleague from Nebraska, Senator FISCHER, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act encourages more employers to provide paid family leave. That is good news for millions of American families who will welcome a child this year.

My Democratic colleagues like to speak about the importance of paid leave, but not a single one of them voted with us—not one. Every Democrat in the House and in the Senate voted against the bill that included Senator FISCHER's paid family leave incentives. Every one of them voted against a bill that included a bigger standard deduction and the doubling of the childcare credit and lower income tax rates. Fortunately, we passed this historic achievement despite their efforts to stop it.

Thanks to every Republican who voted for tax reform, both Walmart and Lowe's have announced expansions of both maternity and paternity leave. CVS is creating an entirely new parental leave program. In Wisconsin, where only one of two Senators voted for reform, American Family Insurance is expanding its family leave benefits. So is Broadridge Financial Solutions in New York, despite both Senators from New York voting against it. This is only the beginning.

My Democratic colleagues said tax reform would bring about ''Armageddon.'' They said nothing in our bill would help American workers. But the proof is in the pudding. The evidence is piling up. Middle-class families all over the country are glad their Congress and their President made tax reform a reality.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

PARKLAND, FLORIDA, SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise with a heavy heart for the people of Parkland, FL, and Stoneman Douglas High School, where yesterday 17 Americans were killed in the deadliest school shooting since Sandy Hook. It was the 18th school shooting this year, and we are only halfway through February.

Again, yesterday the scourge of gun violence visited an American school, a place where our kids should be able to learn free from the shadow of violence and mayhem. Again, we all watched the scenes with children running for their lives. Again, a twisted soul got ahold of an assault rifle and unleashed carnage on the innocent.

Even though we didn't see it, in millions of bedrooms and living rooms in Americans' homes last night, 10-year-old, 8-year-old, 12-year-old children were saying: Mom, Dad, what happened? What do I do if this happens in my school?

I address this Chamber knowing there are no words that could ease the anguish and the sorrow felt by the parents of those 17 Americans, by their friends and siblings, their neighbors and teachers.

As we remember the words of Scripture that tell us ''Blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted,'' let us resolve to do something—something—about the epidemic of gun violence in this country.

Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, Senators from both parties engaged in negotiations for months to find a solution that would allow the Dreamers to stay in the United States as well as provide border security. On several occasions, those discussions have yielded results, including last night, when a bipartisan group of moderate Senators reached a breakthrough agreement.

The spotlight now turns to the rest of the Senate and especially to President Trump, who throughout these negotiations has not been constructive. President Trump has shown a remarkable ability to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. President Trump, since he created the problem by terminating DACA last August, has stood in the way of every single proposal that has had a chance of becoming law. He turned his back on not one but two bipartisan immigration proposals earlier this year. I went so far as to put the President's wall on the table, and still the President would not take yes for an answer.

Now President Trump seems eager to spike the latest bipartisan compromise, potentially with a veto. Why?

Because it isn't 100 percent of what the President wants on immigration? That is not how democracy works. You don't get 100 percent of what you want in a democracy—maybe in a dictatorship. You have to give and take. You have to compromise in order to make progress. We have tried to do that in Congress, to solve a problem the President has created. Yet, time and again, he has frustrated our efforts.

If the American people want to know why Congress can look so dysfunctional, they ought to look to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. If the President had been quiet, if the President had let us do our work, a bipartisan compromise would have already passed this Chamber with 65 votes, maybe more, and we would have a solution to protect the Dreamers. But here we are. Let's hope it happens.

If President Trump rejects another bipartisan compromise, there is no question that the American people will blame President Trump and no one else for the failure to protect Dreamers. With an obstinate President and a fractious House, I hope today the Senate rises to the occasion.

The Dreamers are watching this debate right now because their futures depend on it. If we don't succeed, they face deportation to countries they don't remember. They have lived in this country their entire lives, pledged allegiance to our flag, built families, careers, served in our military. They didn't break any laws. They were brought here through no fault of their own. And despite their status, despite the fear that comes with living in the shadows, they strived hopefully to make a successful life in this country, which they love. What can be more American than that? We owe it to them to find a solution that can pass this body of Congress.

The only solution, unfortunately, that my friend the Republican leader has offered is the very partisan Grassley bill—no input from Democrats, no effort to compromise. We Democrats, on the other hand, have supported several bipartisan agreements on the table. We are ready to vote on them, including the genuine, bipartisan compromise that moderates, Democratic and Republican, reached last night.

There are plenty of things for everybody not to like in this bill. There is a lot I don't like in it, believe me. I think the wall will not accomplish anything. It will be an enormous waste of money and will be a terrible symbol of our America, replacing the beautiful lady who stands in the harbor I represent. But compromise is compromise. Democrats and Republicans will find provisions they don't want and wouldn't include if they had written it. But we have to do our jobs today. We have to rise above our differences, admit that no one will get everything they want, and accept the painful compromises that come with democratic government. That is what the Senate has done through the centuries. It has been hard. People have anguished. In the past, the Senate has risen to the occasion. Can it do it today? I say that to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. No one else seems willing to do it—not the House, not the President. It is the Senate—what President Washington famously called the cooling saucer for our politics—that can show the Nation how to lead, that can show the Nation what bipartisanship looks like, what compromise looks like, what progress looks like. The Senate can do that today.

Let's do our job. Let's rise to the occasion. And by the end of today, let's say to the Dreamers that the Senate believes America has a place for them too.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

PARKLAND, FLORIDA, SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I join with many others who are praying for the families in Florida today as they grieve—an overwhelming grief that most parents would never contemplate—because they do not have the opportunity to take their kids to school today because their lives were taken yesterday. I continue to pray for, engage in, and help in any way that we can through this process.

I know so many of the schools in my State have taken active steps over the past many years to provide greater security in the schools, with lockdown access and other things that they have done intentionally to provide greater and greater security. There is no explanation for an individual who is a former student of a school to return to the school with a gun and with who knows what motivation.

So we will continue to pray, engage, and work with schools on security, as we have done from this body in the past, as well as to provide financial resources to help schools and their security systems, to help provide advice and counsel—to do what can be done. We will pray along with the families who struggle deeply, and we will walk with them through their incredible, inexplicable grief.

Mr. President, this is a week that has been set aside for the immigration debate, but today is the first day there has been any real immigration debate on the floor. It is Thursday. All week, this floor has sat mostly empty. For months, there has been the preparation to put immigration bills on the floor, but as of earlier this week, there had only been one bill that had actually been proposed—the President's bill—to be able to say: Here is a middle-ground position.

After months of negotiation and the White House meeting with everybody—both sides of the aisle from the House and the Senate—the White House laid out a proposal and said: Here is a middle ground. I would say that the White House has moved a tremendous amount in this and has dropped a tremendous number of issues. Over the course of the past several months, the White House has moved away from a lot of things.

First, it moved from legal status to saying: OK, let's do citizenship. It is not citizenship for just the 690,000 individuals who are currently in DACA, but the White House opened this up—and I agree—to 1.8 million individuals who are not only DACA students but to those who are also DACA-eligible, those who did not sign up for the process but who could have been eligible for it.

Interestingly enough, the President even moved from President Obama's position. President Obama's position for DACA was that you had to be in the country by 2007. President Trump has moved that and said he will be more open. You will have had to have been in the country by the time President Obama announced the program in 2012. That was a significant concession which has opened up the program for almost 1 million more individuals.

The trade-off was pretty straightforward. He had a long list of items to be able to provide border security—both interior enforcement and border security. Yet, over the past couple of months, the President has backed up and said OK. The Democrats have said they absolutely do not want any interior enforcement of any immigration laws added in any way, so the President backed up and said: Let's start with border security. We want to do interior enforcement in the days ahead, but let's start with border security. The President wanted to address the issue of sanctuary cities, but that is not addressed in this bill. He has dropped that. The President wanted to deal with asylum reform, but he has dropped that issue from his proposal. There is no conversation about refugees and changing how that structure would work. There is no conversation about the H visa programs. He has dropped a lot of issues that were important to the White House and has said: OK. We will deal with those on a different day. Let's limit the issues to this narrow group of four issues, and that is all we will deal with.

He dropped a lot of other issues for it. Border security, dealing with citizenship for those individuals who are in DACA or who are DACA-eligible, dealing with the issue of family migration and how that works together, and then dealing with the issue of the diversity lottery—that is it. Everything else dropped away.

It is not comprehensive—it is small—but border security had very clear definitions. Border security is not just a wall. I have heard some individuals say, even on this floor today, that a wall will not accomplish anything. I would say the President agrees with that. A wall by itself doesn't accomplish anything. A wall is needed in some sections of the border to slow down illegal crossings, especially in urban areas, where there are urban areas on both sides of the border. It is

needed in those areas, but a wall by itself doesn't accomplish anything. You can go around it, and you can go over it eventually. What you need are additional agents. What you need are additional enforcement authorities. What is needed is to be able to break down some of the legal loopholes.

Some proposals that have come out in the last few hours have said they want to strike a bipartisan compromise and say: OK, we will provide for wall funding, and we will allow for the large legalization and naturalization of individuals who are DACA and DACA-eligible. That is a fair trade-off, they say. The problem is when you read the fine print of what that means. I go back to the same statement: If they say a wall doesn't accomplish anything, and all they provide is really a wall and a few technical things around it, then the question remains, What is missing? What would make the difference?

What would make the difference are some very basic things to be able to close legal loopholes. That is what is in the President's proposal—none of them onerous, none of them out of line. They are just dealing with the basic legal loopholes.

We all have to admit, when you see the records from the Department of Homeland Security and from Customs and Border Protection, that there are individuals who cross the border, both adults and unaccompanied minors, who are coached by coyotes as they move through Mexico: When you cross the border, here is what to say. If you say these things, then you will get access into the government.

They know that if they say certain phrases, they are in. I hate to say that is actually true, and it is unaddressed in any of these bipartisan compromises. I don't think it is unrealistic to say that if you go around one of the barriers or even through one of the gated entrances and cross through and immediately get caught by someone on the other side but say the magic phrases, you are in. We have to resolve that, and there are some basic ways to resolve it.

If you come in and have a credible claim of fear or a claim of asylum and cross the border and immediately speak those words, currently you are allowed into the country for 2 or 3 years while your trial goes through the process. Only about 30 percent of those are actually successful. That 30 percent number is significant.

What do we do to resolve it? Why don't we add additional judges and additional courts, and instead of waiting 3 years before you have that hearing, you have that hearing within 3 weeks? No evidence has changed in that time period. You are still allowed to have counsel, and you are still allowed to have insight. But we actually resolve it instead of allowing people to come into the country for 3 years and telling them ''Here is a court date and a court location to appear,'' and you do not know if they appear. In fact, the majority of them do not appear for their court dates, but they are somewhere, at a location unknown, in the country. It is not unreasonable to resolve this issue; yet it is unresolved in all of these bipartisan proposals.

There is no fix to deal with criminal aliens or those individuals who come into the country who are gang members. It is a small minority, but there are those individuals, and there seems to be no fix for those things at all.

There is no dealing with the issue of the hiring process for the Department of Homeland Security. If you are in remote areas on the northern border—there are requests to add additional compensation to some of these areas or to give additional benefits to some of these Customs and Border Protection folks because they work in very remote areas along the border. They ask for this year after year after year, and there is nothing addressed in the bipartisan agreement. It is just the wall and asking: Shouldn't that be enough? It is not.

There is no dealing with drugs like fentanyl and trying to interdict those in the border areas.

It doesn't provide any deterrence for the visa overstays. About 40 percent of the individuals who are illegally in this country right now came on a tourist visa or on some other kind of visa and just overstayed it. We have to resolve those issues as well. That seems to be an obvious issue.

There is no dealing with some of the basic statements. What do I mean by that? Under some of the bipartisan bills that are coming out, you prove yourself to be a DACA-eligible individual by your own verbal statement that you are eligible. No documentation is required. I think that is an obvious loophole. If you are DACA-eligible, even, in fact, under President Obama's proposal, you have to show documentation that you are DACA-eligible. Yet, in these new proposals, you don't. You just have to say that you are eligible, and suddenly you are eligible. That is a major problem.

The structure of how some of the bipartisan agreements have come out has also become a big issue for me because it doesn't really deal with just this 10-year. In one section of the bill, it says it is a 10-year path toward citizenship. I have no issue, if we can do border security, with having a 10-year path toward citizenship. It allows us to have 10 years to deal with the basic border security things. It gives certainty to those individuals who are in the country that they are headed toward citizenship. I have absolutely no problem with that, but the bipartisan agreement that has come out doesn't do that. In one section, it says a 10-year path to citizenship. In another section, it gives the recipients the opportunity to get legal permanent residency—green cards—much faster, which then moves them on to a much faster track. It is a little bit of a sleight of hand that we say 10 years in one part and in another part say that it is actually 5 to 7 years. Say what you mean. Don't try to say two different things and have two different paths.

I was also interested in a change that was slipped in at the very back of the bipartisan bill that makes an enormous change to the status of every single individual in the country. Let me just read this. It is being said that this bill is just about a wall and just about DACA, but let me read this section in the back of the bill: In carrying out immigration enforcement activities, the Secretary shall prioritize available immigration enforcement resources to aliens who have been convicted of a felony, a significant misdemeanor, three or more misdemeanor offenses, pose a threat to national security or public safety, or are unlawfully present in the United States, and—that is an important word in there, ''and''—they arrived in the United States after June 30, 2018.

Do you know what that says? That says the Department of Homeland Security can't go after anyone in the country illegally who arrives here before June 30, 2018. In other words, the race is on. If you can get into the country and across the border before June 30 of this year, you are in, and you have amnesty—for millions. That is not about DACA; that is every single individual in the country unlawfully present. If you are in the country unlawfully present before June 30 of this year, according to this bill, you are in until you commit a felony. As long as you don't do that, you will never have any enforcement of any type. I was stunned to see that slipped into the back of the bill.

This was dropped last night, and we still have the opportunity to go through it, but I am quite surprised at the number of people who have pushed back on the President and have either not read his proposal or have ignored what he put on the table. It is not an unreasonable proposal. It is a straightforward, commonsense proposal. I would encourage those folks who oppose it to read it first and to see what it actually says.

There has been pushback on the issue of chain migration or family reunification. Let me set this in context. Right now, we have a 20-year backlog for individuals coming into the country legally. That is an incentive not to do legal immigration because if you are going to wait in the line 20 years long, many are just not going to go through the process. Unless we reform how we do the family integration, once 2 million additional people are added to this in the 10-year time period, I have no question we will move from a 20-year backlog to a 25-year backlog as family members also reconnect with those individuals coming in. What happens at that point? A bad situation gets even worse in our immigration policy.

The issue of family reunification and the proposals that were laid out have not been partisan proposals in the past,

but suddenly because President Trump put it out there, it is suddenly an unrealistic partisan proposal. May I remind everyone that this issue was also dealt with in the 2013 Gang of 8 bill that got around 70 votes in the Senate—this very similar issue of family reunification and how this would work. In 1995, during the Clinton administration, a proposal was made by Democratic House Member Barbara Jordan, leading the Commission on Immigration that made almost the exact same proposal in 1995.

This was just not a partisan issue until now. For some reason, because President Trump wants to propose it, it is an angry Republican issue. It has been a bipartisan, commonsense issue for a long time on how to deal with an obvious issue in our immigration reform.

I would encourage my colleagues to read the bill and see what is in it, not what is being said in the media about it. See what is really in it, and if there is a question and a dialogue about it, let's amend it. Let's go through it because it is a very unique and powerful opportunity to set it right for those individuals who are in the DACA and DACA-eligible population to finally not be in limbo but to finally have permanence and to know they are home in this country where most of them have grown up; that they are not just long-term guests, they are home.

This is the way to resolve this but at the same time do what Americans have cried for, for a long time—actually secure our borders and start the process of reforming our immigration system in a way that makes sense for everybody—for the immigrant, for the born citizen of the United States, for the naturalized citizen, and to make sure it is fair for everyone. That is not unreasonable. In fact, it is a good idea.

If it were only proposed by someone else, I think a lot of folks on both sides of the aisle would agree with it. Take the politics out of it and look at the policy. Let's resolve this for the country.

I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Michigan.

CHANGE ACT

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we have so many issues in front of us that are critically important to families. I want to speak about an issue today that is extremely important to so many Michigan families and to families across the Nation.

It is estimated that 5.5 million Americans are living with Alzheimer's disease, including 1 out of 10 people over the age of 65. That number is growing. To put that in perspective, that is about the same number of people who live in Wisconsin or Minnesota or Colorado.

By 2050, it is estimated that as many as 16 million Americans may be living with Alzheimer's. That is more people than live in Pennsylvania or Illinois. From Alaska to Alabama, to New Mexico, to Maine, no State is immune, as we know. In my own State of Michigan, the number of people living with Alzheimer's disease is expected to rise from about 180,000 today to 220,000 in the year 2025, which is not very far away. That is an increase of about 22 percent in less than 7 years.

The cost of providing healthcare and long-term care for people affected by Alzheimer's is astronomical and growing. In fact, one out of every five Medicare dollars goes to Alzheimer's disease. It is estimated that last year, for the first time, the United States spent more than a quarter of a trillion dollars on Alzheimer's-related care. Without better treatments or a cure, those costs could surpass $1.1 trillion by 2050.

Of course, much higher than the dollar cost is the human cost. As anyone who has lived with the disease or anyone who has had a family member live with the disease can tell you—and this really is the ultimate family disease—Alzheimer's and related dementias are thieves. They steal everything—memories, personalities, even lives. No price tag could ever be put on the suffering they cause patients and their families and the strain they place on caregivers.

There are 15 million people in the United States caring for a family member with Alzheimer's. While many of them consider caring for a loved one a sacred duty, this duty still exacts a physical and mental toll on them. Caregivers suffer higher rates of heart disease, cancer, and depression than those in the broader population, and many are forced to quit their jobs or reduce the hours they work, creating additional personal and financial stresses.

Lauren Kovach of Brighton, MI, learned what that is like when her grandma—she calls her Chupe—was diagnosed with Alzheimer's. Lauren's mom was a caregiver. She and Lauren made a pact that they would never put Chupe in a nursing home because she, in Lauren's words, ''lived her life for her family and to take care of us—of course we were going to do the same for her.''

That required a lot of sacrifices. Lauren's mom retired early. Lauren withdrew from college and moved in with her mom to provide a ''loving home full of laughter,'' as she said. They received no help with caregiving or living expenses. Lauren wrote:

> My mom is single-handedly the best person I know. She needs help. We need help. Many hundreds of families like mine need help.

Lauren's beloved grandma passed away last June, but Lauren is still fighting, and I am proud to be fighting alongside her. She wrote:

> I go to Lansing each year for Advocacy Day—I will talk to anyone and everyone about this disease that is ruining millions of lives, including mine. Alzheimer's unfortunately isn't going anywhere anytime soon, but neither am I.

This fighting spirit is what keeps caregivers like Lauren going, and they deserve to know that we are, in fact, fighting alongside them. That is why Senator CAPITO and I have introduced legislation that will help give families in West Virginia, Michigan, and all across the country new tools to cope with an Alzheimer's diagnosis and the life that follows.

I would like to thank my friend from West Virginia for partnering with me on this important bill. The CHANGE Act builds on my HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, which was implemented beginning last year and supports parents and their families by requiring Medicare to pay for an individual care plan when a family member is diagnosed. This encourages more doctors to feel there is a reason to have early diagnosis because there is something they can do for people. It is certainly something that families need in order to have a plan, an action plan, once they receive that diagnosis.

The CHANGE Act approaches this disease from a number of different directions and builds on the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act.

First, it encourages early assessment and diagnosis. This is not happening as much as we would like. The Alzheimer's Association polling has indicated that a very high number—35 percent to 40 percent—of physicians are not doing early diagnosis. Oftentimes, they have said it is because they don't know what to do about it. There is no cure. There is not something to offer families other than fear.

We want to make sure there is early diagnosis because there is a lot going on right now with medications that actually will help early. We want to make sure that patients have more time to make their own healthcare decisions, to access community-based support services for their family truly to be able to plan. Through HOPE for Alzheimer's, we now have a caregiving plan that the physician will be reimbursed for coordinating and bringing together. But there is much more that we need to do.

Early diagnosis also gives patients and their families additional opportunities to participate in clinical trials. There is great research going on in Michigan and across the country that really does provide hope.

I am encouraged and hopeful about the additional dollars we just agreed to in the budget agreement last week. I was proud to be one of those pushing for additional research dollars for the National Institutes of Health. Hopefully, those opportunities and cures will come even faster.

Second, the CHANGE Act would improve care by testing what types of programs most help patients, their

families, and caregivers. We know that case management, coordination of care, and caregiver support services can make a big difference both in the quality of life for patients and caregivers and in participation in clinical trials.

In addition, the CHANGE Act would offer States the opportunity to test programs that help Alzheimer's patients to remain in the community—which is so important—by reducing the financial burden on family caregivers.

Finally, the CHANGE Act would help uncover regulatory and legislative changes that would help accelerate Alzheimer's disease research, which is so critical right now. Families in Michigan and across the country have been waiting long enough. They have been waiting too long. They need a cure. Until that day comes, they need better treatments and more support.

Just ask Nora Ann Reid-LeZotte of Kalamazoo. Only a few months after her father's death, her mom started to show signs of Alzheimer's. Nora Ann was determined to care for her mom at home. Given that she is a nurse practitioner, Nora Ann figured she was perfectly prepared to assume the role of caregiver—and then, she says, she wasn't.

''My days, then weeks, then years became more overwhelming than I could have imagined,'' Nora Ann said of the 6 years she spent caregiving. Nora Ann and her husband moved in with her mom to care for her and rented out their own house to make ends meet. Caregiver support would have made a huge difference, Nora Ann said, yet none was available until her mom's condition deteriorated enough that she needed IV infusions to stay hydrated.

Nora Ann said:

> I was exhausted. I lost my own identity, my friends, and my life for that timeframe. My family suffered and sacrificed so I could care for my mom with dignity and safety.

She added:

> I would do it all again because she was my mom.

I can certainly identify with that, as I know all of us can. Nora Ann put her own life on hold to make her mom's final years as comfortable as possible. People like Nora Ann deserve our praise. Even more than that, they deserve our support and action on their behalf.

It is time for a change. Let's pass this legislation as quickly as possible to help patients, support caregivers, and find better treatments and a cure. Families across Michigan and the country are waiting.

I yield the floor.

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

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE FLORIDA SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate observe a moment of silence for the victims of the school shooting in Florida.

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

The Senate will now observe a moment of silence for the victims of the Florida school shooting.

(Moment of silence.)

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, those were all our children. Those of us who are parents, you can imagine the parents of those children wondering what else can be done because yesterday a former student at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Northern Broward County, Parkland, FL, walked onto the campus with a gas mask, smoke grenades, carrying an AR–15 assault rifle. He pulled a fire alarm, waited for students to come out into the hallway, and he opened fire. As a result, 17 families are grieving. Their worst fears have become reality. More than a dozen other students who were injured are in the hospital, and some of them are in critical condition.

At some point, we have to say enough is enough. At some point, we as a society have to come together and put a stop to this. This Senator grew up on a ranch. I have hunted all my life. I have had guns all my life. I still hunt with my son, but an AR–15 is not for hunting; it is for killing. Despite these horrific events that are occurring over and over, these tragedies have led so many of us to come to the floor and beg our colleagues to take commonsense actions that we all know will help protect our children and our fellow citizens from these kinds of tragedies, and we get nowhere.

When is enough going to be enough? Sandy Hook Elementary, 20 students killed—that wasn't enough. The Pulse nightclub in Orlando, 49 people killed by a terrorist—that wasn't enough. Las Vegas, 58 people killed—that wasn't enough. Just a year ago in the same county as the Parkland murders, Broward County's Fort Lauderdale airport, five people killed—that wasn't enough. Now this high school, 17 were killed. Some were as young as 14 years old.

When is enough going to be enough? This Senator has spoken to local officials on the ground. I have spoken to the superintendent of the school, who, in his own way, is going through the grieving process; I have spoken to the FBI; and I have spoken to the sheriff's department to make sure they have everything they need. When we are finished with the Dreamer legislation today, I am headed there. When I go to the hospital and see the families and the hospital victims, all I can think is, How many more times are we going to have to go through this? And those families are going to ask me: When is enough enough?

To those who say now is not the time to talk about gun violence because it is too soon, we don't want to politicize right after a tragedy—that is what is said over and over—I would ask: When is the time? If now is not the right time, when is the right time—after the next shooting or after the one that is going to come after that? Because these are not going to stop unless we change ourselves as a culture. How many more times do we have to do this? How many more folks have to die? When is enough going to be enough? Let's not hide from it. Let's have a conversation about this right now, not just about mental illness—that is part of it—and not just about protection in our schools, and that is part of it. Let's get to the root cause. Let's come together and help end this violence. Let's talk about that 19-year-old carrying an AR–15. Let's do what needs to be done. Let's get these assault weapons off our streets. Let's accomplish something on background checks.

My State passed a constitutional amendment—Florida, 1998—background checks have to be done in the purchase of a gun. It has never been implemented totally, and it has never been enforced—a simple background check. The terrorist who killed 49 people in Orlando at the Pulse Nightclub had been on the terrorist watch list. If we had a background check there—he wasn't on it, but maybe in a background check we ought to include those who have been on the terrorist watch list. Let's have a conversation about this.

Do you remember a couple of years ago there was a proposal on the floor that if you are on the terrorist watch list, you can't buy a gun? That is pretty common sense. We will not let them get on an airplane because we don't want them taking down a commercial airliner, but they don't have a restriction on buying a gun.

Let's get at the root cause of this issue. Let's do what we all know needs to be done. Let's do it now, not later. Let's not just talk about it, let's do something about it. Let's make what happened at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School a pivotal moment in this country's history, not because it was one of the largest mass shootings but, hopefully, because it was the last.

It is with a heavy heart I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I join my colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, with a broken heart, as does most of the Nation due to the events of yesterday.

There, indeed, was a time in the history of our country where after an event such as this there was a mourning period that followed with a policy debate, but today, that time is interrelated and intermixed. I don't blame it. I am not upset about it. In fact, I think there have been too many of

these events now. That is why we continue to face it.

I think it is legitimate to say that even as we mourn, we have an obligation to ask ourselves, Is there something we could have done or should do to ensure that we don't see these things happening?

It is cliche to say, but I think it is important to say: I am the father of two young ladies who happen to be in high school. I cannot imagine, but I can only envision, what it would be like if one day walking through the Capitol I get a text or one of those news alerts that says there has been a shooting in the high school they attend. I can only imagine how fearful it would be when suddenly those texts are not being answered, and those calls are not being returned. I thought about that last night and what it must feel like to be one of those parents at the hotel waiting for word because you hadn't heard from your children in hours or how painful it must have been for those whose job it was to go to these parents and inform them that their child's life—whom they had sent off to school in the morning, perhaps just weeks away from graduation—had ended senselessly in an event such as this. Because of what happened yesterday and because it is happening so often, people from across the political spectrum are arguing, there has to be something we can do; you have to be able to do something.

I agree with that sentiment. I understand it. I would add, though, that if we do something, it should be something that works. The struggle up to this point has been that most of the proposals that have been offered would not have prevented not just yesterday's tragedy but any of those in recent history.

I am going to say now what I am going to really emphasize at the end. Just because these proposals would not have prevented these events does not mean we raise our hands and say, therefore, there is nothing we can do. It is a tough issue. Part of the reason it is so hard to prevent these events is because if someone decides they are going to take it upon themselves to kill people, whether it is a political assassination of one person or the mass killing of many, if one person decides to do it, and they are committed to that task, it is a very difficult thing to stop. Again, that does not mean we should not try to prevent as many of them as we can.

Perhaps the answer to how to prevent them begins by asking ourselves, What do these things have in common? They have two things in common. The first is that every single one of them was premeditated and planned. None of these shootings were an act of passion, where someone got up in the morning, was upset, and decided to do something out of rage. They all involved careful planning and premeditation. They deliberately took steps to get the guns, the weapons, the ammunition they needed. In many cases, they carefully studied the outline of the target they were going to go after. They specifically planned soft targets. There is evidence of that in this case. They planned to maximize the loss of life. They acquired the weapon they needed, and they used tactics they needed to kill as many people as they could.

By the way, that premeditation and planning is one of the reasons why these laws that have been proposed wouldn't have prevented it. When someone is planning and premeditating an attack, they will figure out a way to evade those laws or, quite frankly, to comply with them in order to get around them.

That may be an argument for new laws of a different kind, but it is what makes it hard, though not impossible.

The second thing they have in common is, almost all of these attacks were preceded by clear signs of what was to come. A cursory review this morning of just a handful of the recent cases points that out.

We are all familiar with the loss of life of over 20 people at a Texas church not long ago. This was a case of a killer whose wife had said he had tried to kill her. He was an individual who had been arrested and convicted for domestic violence, which had, unfortunately, never been reported to the background check system. He was an individual who had escaped a mental health facility, who had been caught sneaking guns onto an Air Force base while on Active Duty, who had been discharged from the military for bad conduct, who had had social media posts that had bragged about buying dogs so as to shoot them, and who had actually expressed admiration for the South Carolina killer in that church killing a few years ago. He was an individual who had actually been charged with animal mistreatment just a few years earlier.

At Sandy Hook, we know the killer had a spreadsheet with details of the previous school shootings. He was also an individual whose mental state had rapidly deteriorated to the point at which he had spoken to no one but his mother, whom he ultimately had killed before having carried out the horrific massacre. He had been someone who had been isolated in a room all day, who had largely played video games.

The Pulse attack was precipitated and inspired by an adherence to the jihadist ideology. As Senator NELSON has already pointed out, this individual not once but twice had been on the FBI's radar screen and both times had been cleared. They had interviewed him, and they had asked him questions. He hadn't met the standard for staying on the list, and he had gone off.

We are still learning facts about yesterday's killer. Unlike these others, we may learn more because he was apprehended alive. Authorities have had an opportunity to question him, and that will continue. Here is what we know:

We know he was expelled from school for behavior the administrators often thought was dangerous. We know now from press accounts that both teachers and students did not act surprised that he was the assailant. In fact, many of them said there was a running joke—obviously not a joke anymore—that, one day, he would do something like this. We know the media and others have discovered social media posts that are, in hindsight, deeply disturbing, as they point to the glorification of gun violence and murder and even animal cruelty, apparently. We saw reports this morning of a post on YouTube a year ago on which he posted that he wanted to be a school shooter. The FBI was alerted to this and had followed up, by the way, in an interview with the person who had alerted them.

They all have this premeditation in common, and we sit here in hindsight, in seeing all of these little points and say, taken together, those are warning signs. The problem is, they are not taken together because the people who might have known about his being expelled may not have known about the social media posts, and the people who knew about the social media posts may not have known what he wrote on YouTube, and the people who knew about the YouTube may not have known about the fact that the police had been called several times for different reasons and so forth—hence, the challenge in finding something that works.

There are a lot of proposals, and I will share them because I have heard them before, and I hear them today. I am not diminishing them. I don't want this to be taken as ''because it will not work, I don't even want to hear your argument.'' I understand. I really do. You read in the newspaper that they used certain kinds of guns; therefore, let's make it harder to get those kinds of guns. I don't have some sort of de facto religious objection to that or some ideological commitment to that per se. There are all kinds of guns that are outlawed and weaponry that is outlawed and/or a special category. The problem is, we did that once, and it didn't work for a lot of reasons. One of them is that there are already millions of them on the streets, and those things last 100 years.

You could pass a law that makes it hard to get this kind of gun in a new condition, but you are going to struggle to keep it out of the hands of someone who has decided that is what he wants to use because there are so many of them out there already that would be grandfathered in.

You could do a background check. The truth is, in almost all of these cases I have cited, the individuals either erroneously passed background checks or would have passed them or did. Even if they couldn't pass the background checks, they could buy the guns the way MS–13 does and other gangs and other street elements do—from the black market.

Again, it is not that we shouldn't have the background check. I am just

trying to be clear and honest here. If someone has decided ''I am going to commit this crime,'' he will find a way to get the gun to do it. That doesn't mean you shouldn't have a law that makes it harder. It just means, to be honest, that it is not going to stop this from happening. You could still pass the law per se, but you are still going to have these horrible attacks.

That is why I do think that in some circles, it is not fair or right to create this impression that somehow this attack happened yesterday because there is some law out there that we could have passed to have prevented it. If there had been such a law that could have prevented what happened yesterday, I think a lot of people would have supported it, but I also want to be honest with the people who share my point of view on these issues.

I think it is also wrong to say there is nothing we can do. I would admit that, perhaps, even I in the past, in the way I have addressed this issue or have spoken about it, may have come off as dismissive in the argument that since none of these laws would have worked, there is just nothing we can do, and we will just have to deal with it. Just because I don't have a quick or an easy answer for how to prevent these doesn't mean we don't have an obligation to try and find one, and by finding one, I don't mean a quick and easy answer. I mean an answer that would work.

When I took office here, I swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States—every element of it. I didn't write the Constitution, but I agree with it, and I support it. The Second Amendment is in the Constitution, and you can debate what the outlines of the Second Amendment are or how far it goes, but it is in there, and I happen to support it. Oftentimes, I happen to point to the Second Amendment and say it is the Second Amendment that is right after free speech, which tells you how important it was to those who wrote those words. I still believe every bit of that.

If it is fair to say the Second Amendment is so important—and I reiterate it because of how high up it is in the ranking from first to second, its being the second one—then I have to recognize there is a part of the Constitution that was written even before the Second Amendment. It is the preamble. That preamble lays out why we have a Constitution and, ultimately, why we have a government. In it, it reads that two of the reasons we have a government and, therefore, two of the reasons we have a Senate is to ensure domestic tranquility and to promote the general welfare.

These school shootings and mass shootings and murders we are seeing now at an accelerated pace are, by definition, a threat to our domestic tranquility and a threat to our general welfare—the murder of children in schools, the murder of moviegoers, the murder of people at a church, the murder of people at a dance club on a Saturday night. These are all places at which we should be enjoying the general welfare and domestic tranquility.

Even as we recognize that the Second Amendment gives Americans the right to bear arms and protect themselves—a right I strongly support and will continue to support—we must also recognize that same Constitution places upon this government an obligation to ensure domestic tranquility and promote the general welfare.

We must confront the fact that, over the last 20 years, these attacks have accelerated. We must recognize the evidence that they are not isolated from one another and are building upon one another. We must recognize the scary reality that even as the Nation mourns and the parents grieve, there is a high probability, if not a certainty, that somewhere in America right now, some equally troubled, deranged, and violent individual is reading and watching coverage of this attack and gaining from it not sorrow but inspiration. Even as we speak here now, even as we stand here in mourning, and even as the days go by, there are probably some people out there who are going to try to do this because of what happened yesterday. That is a frightening thought, but it is a reality. It challenges us to find an answer to a very difficult issue of all of these bits and pieces of information out there.

How do we in this society confront those who do things about which in another era we would just say, ''Well, they are just strange people. They are just weird. They are just going through a phase''?

We cannot do it anymore. There is no longer such a thing as just innocent postings online that you just look at and say, ''Well, that is just them. They are just strange. They don't mean anything by it'' or ''they are harmless.'' We cannot assume that anymore—none of us.

How do we create a system in which all of these disconnected pieces and bits of data could somehow be tied together so whenever it was that this killer got ahold of these weapons and before conducting this attack, someone would say, ''Hold on a second. This person is the person who got expelled from school, who had these social media posts, who said he wanted to be a school shooter, who had his adopted mother pass away in November and who is now living, isolated, whose fellow students had all suspected him of being a person who could, one day, be violent''?

How do you take these bits and pieces of information and turn them into a usable source of data that perhaps either prevents the acquisition of a weapon or, preferably, intervenes in that person's life before he carries this out? If anyone here tells you he has that one figured out, he is not being honest.

This is hard, but we need to do it. We need to somehow figure it out because it goes to the very core of why we exist. There is no greater obligation of our government than to keep our people safe from threats, both foreign and domestic, and we must acknowledge that this is a threat. For whatever reason, we now live in a society in which someone, at 19 years of age, in the freest and the most prosperous Nation in all of human history, has decided to take it upon himself to take the lives of 17 individuals and severely injure 14 others—and to actually, probably, try to kill even more.

What is happening in our country, in our culture, in our society?

If there is something to be done with our laws, we should do that too. I am not saying don't focus on the gun part, but we also have to focus on the violence part, for to talk about gun violence requires you to talk about both, and the violence part is the one that goes well beyond an easy government solution and entails all kinds of different aspects of modern life that we are still grappling with.

I hope we can start to figure it out. I haven't had the time, frankly, in less than 18 hours, to bring to the floor a proposal for how we will move forward or what the forum will be for this conversation to even begin. I know we can no longer just chalk it up to just isolated incidents because it has happened too often. Sadly, I believe it will happen again until we confront it and try to solve it. I hope we will, and I believe we can. I believe we must, for, as I said at the outset and will say in conclusion, it goes to the core of why we even exist to begin with—to keep our people safe no matter how new, how different, or how unique the threat may be.

I yield the floor.

BROADER OPTIONS FOR AMERICANS ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, right now it is estimated that 700,000 Dreamers face the very real threat that they may be ripped from the only life and the only country they have ever known. These are young people who have grown up in America. They go to school here. They work hard here. Often, they work at multiple jobs. They get terrific grades. They give back to their communities. They have done everything right.

I have met with them at home. My colleague Senator MERKLEY and I have met with many of them at joint meetings. A number of them say point blank: We like to serve America. We believe in America.

That is all they have known. They serve in the military. They want to do police work. They want to be first responders.

In fact, to earn their DACA status, they had to come forward, give their information to our government, and then submit to a background check. Now they are living under this cloud of

uncertainty because the President, on his own, stamped an expiration date on the DACA Program.

What I wish to do for a few minutes is to talk about these terrific young people—these special young people, the Dreamers—and what they contribute to our country.

I was very pleased recently to have Esli Becerra join me at this year's State of the Union speech because in my view he and his younger brother Kevin embody the very best about our country. Esli came to Oregon when he was 8 months old. He got his first job before he was 10 in order to support his family. I am going to talk a little bit about these two terrific young people because, literally, for years now, each of them would take turns working to support the other, so that between them they were always saying: We want to do it the American way. We want to do it by dint of hard work and thrift and in the spirit we have in this country, where if you work hard, there aren't any limits to what you can achieve. They are two very, very special young men.

Esli wanted to get a higher education. So his younger brother put in the sweat equity to make it happen. Kevin, who is a U.S. citizen, worked more than 80 hours a week after he graduated from high school to help pay for Esli to go to Lane Community College in Eugene.

Let me repeat that. Kevin, a U.S. citizen, who worked in our office, as well, worked more than 80 hours a week after he got out of high school because he said: I want to help my brother get ahead.

Esli has now built a real professional career. He is a visual effects artist in Portland. So he has turned around, and he is stepping up to help pay for Kevin's college education. We have these two remarkable brothers who, year after year, were either working or going to school in order to help each other get ahead in the way that we hope young people will do by dint of hard work and discipline and supporting each other. They are brothers, and they have been in each other's corner and supportive of their families their whole lives. We need more people in America like the Becerra brothers.

They are not alone. Another of Oregon's estimated 11,000 Dreamers is a young man named Daniel Kim. He immigrated legally to Beaverton, OR, from South Korea, but he learned that his immigration lawyer never filed the paperwork needed to get permanent legal status. So without this information, he found out very abruptly that he was considered undocumented.

Thanks to DACA and a special military recruitment program, Daniel had the opportunity to serve our country. He seized the opportunity and joined the U.S. Army the first chance he got.

I will state that I just find it painful to hear the disparaging talk about immigrants. Unfortunately, the President uses that kind of language too often. Maybe it is easy for people in Washington, DC, to forget that these debates are about real people. They are not just about acronyms and numbers. Daniel and Esli are the types of young people this debate is about—a soldier on the frontlines defending our country, a young man working hard at home in Oregon and supporting his family. These are the young people whose lives have been turned upside down by a Presidential decision, and they are just pawns in this raging political battle.

Young people like Esli and Daniel signed up for DACA so they could work and give back to the country. Dreamers are integral parts of their communities. They pitch in and help those communities grow. If all DACA recipients lost their protections, it would be a massive economic hit to our country—$280 billion lost. Even going beyond the humanitarian impact of breaking up families, that is what DACA recipients mean from a dollars-and-cents standpoint.

The crisis Dreamers are facing began last year when the President made the decision to terminate the program. Senators from both parties have now been working to fix it. Time after time, Senators have brought bipartisan ideas forward, and I would like to note at this point that Senator SCHUMER went to the President and put the border wall on the table for discussion, making it clear that this was something that he didn't support but that he would put it out there just to try to generate some goodwill and to try to find a way to get folks working together. Throughout this discussion, sometimes it seems the President just will not take yes for an answer.

So Senators from both sides keep working in the best tradition of this body. On the healthcare front, we sure showed here recently what could be done when there is bipartisanship and Senators are working together. He sits right over there—Chairman HATCH of the Finance Committee. He and I worked together. I am the ranking Democrat on the committee. We now have a 10-year authorization to the Children's Health Insurance Program. Nobody would have ever imagined that a year and a half ago. We have made a transformative set of changes in Medicare to update the Medicare guarantee to cover chronic illness, cancer, diabetes, heart disease, and stroke—where most of the healthcare spending is. We got that done, as well as the biggest change in child welfare policy in the Families First Program, an approach that Democrats and Republicans had been dreaming about for 30 years. I bring it up only by way of saying that bipartisanship can break out here in the Senate.

Right now, as I am on the floor, I know we still have a big group of Democrats and Republicans who are saying that this is too important to just have another political food fight. They are working on a compromise plan—Democrats and Republicans—that would bring this DACA crisis to a close, invest in border security, make some changes to our legal immigration system, and particularly do justice to the Dreamers, like young Esli Becerra.

The reality is that when we are doing something like that, it is pretty obvious that nobody gets the bill they would have written. Nobody gets the bill they would have written for themselves if they were to go back to their office and take out a sheet of paper and write down from A to Z, but that is pretty much what we have to recognize if we are going to find some common ground. That is how the bipartisan process is supposed to work.

Colleagues, bipartisanship is not about taking each other's dumb ideas. Anybody can do that. Bipartisanship is about taking each other's good ideas. That is where we have a big group of Senators—Democrats and Republicans—working together on this issue.

Unfortunately, it seems that recent reports indicate that the President and his team are working to derail this bipartisan solution. They are insisting on some kind of approach that will make radical changes to the legal immigration system, for example.

I wish to note for a second that this is very important in the Wyden household. My parents fled the Nazis in the 1930s. Not all got out. My dad basically talked his way into the Army. They weren't all that interested in my dad. He was overweight, and he had health problems. But my dad convinced them that he was a German kid, and he could write propaganda pamphlets that we could drop on the Nazis, telling them that they were going to die and they were going to freeze. My dad was the most patriotic person I ever met. We are better because of legal immigration in this country. Yet in order to get this compromise, we have now seen proposals to radically change the legal immigration system.

I see my colleague, an outstanding member of the Finance Committee, who knows so much about these immigration issues on the floor, and I look forward to his remarks.

The fact is, the President is demanding an approach that goes way beyond DACA and border security, which are two natural bookends for bipartisanship, and it is where this debate begins. Unfortunately, what the President is really pushing breaks up families and severely cuts back legal immigration, and I just noted that I have seen why legal immigration makes our country better and stronger. What the President is talking about would, on top of this, do enormous economic harm to this country and is certainly not going to get the votes here in the Senate to proceed with 60 votes. The bipartisan solution on which both sides have worked hard together is the best opportunity that the Chamber has to end the DACA crisis.

The Senate really cannot come up with sustainable solutions when we

just play to those who take the most extreme view. We can't get a sustainable solution. By the way, that is how debates in the Senate are supposed to work—two parties, hand in hand, bringing their ideas forward and finding solutions both sides can agree on. That is why I mentioned Chairman HATCH and our finally getting the major health reforms recently that people never dreamed were possible.

On this debate at hand, the question of justice for the Dreamers and reasonable border security—two bookends that I happen to think could fit and produce principled bipartisanship through this group of Senators who are working together—this is our opportunity. Millions of families across the country are following this debate, and they are hoping to get some good news on this issue where there has been gridlock for so long.

Passing the bipartisan proposal is our opportunity to give it to them. This is the time for the Congress to come up with a permanent solution for Dreamers. This is not something to be deferred any longer. It is time to act now. I urge my colleagues in the strongest way possible to support the bipartisan proposal—Democrats and Republicans coming together—when there is an opportunity to vote on it, which I believe will be shortly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor today, fully aware that time is running out for America's Dreamers. Their fates rest in our hands. Their futures hang in the balance of our votes, and what Dr. King called ''the fierce urgency of now'' is officially upon us.

If we fail to take action today, the dreams of 800,000 young people protected under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA, and thousands of others like them will turn to nightmares. It is truly a terrifying prospect that Dreamers face—the prospect that at any moment after they fall out of status, they could be snatched up by President Trump's deportation forces, torn away from their families, and sent away to countries they consider foreign lands. Well, I refuse to be complicit in that nightmare.

I refuse to be complicit in the deportation of innocent children. I refuse to be complicit in the deportation of 800,000 DACA recipients and the 22,000 Dreamers living, studying, and working in my home State of New Jersey. It is only out of compassion for them and commitment to them that I am prepared to vote for the bipartisan deal reached last night, the Rounds-King version.

Let me be very clear. This is not the deal I would have drafted. It is far from the deal I would want, but I know for a fact that it is the only deal with a shot at becoming law. It is the only deal with any hope of earning 60 votes, a simple majority in the House, and maybe the forced signature of Donald Trump's pen. Therefore, it is the only deal with any hope of protecting more than a million Dreamers across America from the President's mass deportation agenda.

To my fellow Democrats, to my friends and fellow leaders in the Hispanic community, to those in the immigration advocacy community, and to the millions of Americans in New Jersey and across the Nation who stood by Dreamers throughout this ordeal, I will not sugarcoat things. This deal is not the fairness that we would want. It is not as fiscally responsible as it should be. To be honest, if my Republican colleagues truly wanted to protect America's Dreamers in good faith, they would have done so months ago. Instead, they refused to address this crisis for months.

Republicans chose to treat Dreamers like bargaining chips, pawns that could be used to advance far-right restrictions on lawful, family-sponsored immigration to the United States and to deliver President Trump a big, fat $25 billion kiss in the form of border wall funding. The only thing more preposterous than asking Mexico to pay for a border wall is asking the American people to pay $25 billion for a border wall. That is $25 billion that could be going to repairing the walls of our crumbling public schools, outdated airports, and aging highway tunnels. That is $25 billion Americans will have to pay for Donald Trump's broken promise that Mexico would foot the bill.

In case you couldn't tell by now, I am not the biggest fan of this deal. It is a bitter pill to swallow. So when I hear my Republican colleagues say that this legislation isn't tough enough, I encourage them to take a closer look. Look at the hard choices that I—and the community that I come from and others in this country—have to make to support this deal, as the most senior Hispanic-American in the Congress, as the son of immigrants whose thirst for freedom brought them to these shores, as the senior Senator from New Jersey, one of the most ethnically and racially diverse States in America.

Many of the concessions Democrats agreed to were supposed to have died in the proposal that we and the Gang of 6 brought to the President weeks ago—only to have him reject it under the advice of the ethnocentric voices in his ear. For example, legal, permanent residents will no longer be able to sponsor their adult children to join them in this country, and that is not the only hard choice we had to make in order to protect Dreamers from deportation. While we grant them the opportunity to earn a 12-year pathway to citizenship, we pay a dear price by limiting the right to sponsor the parents they love so dearly, although other U.S.-citizen families will be able to do so.

I take solace in the possibility that someday in the future, hopefully, in the not too distant future, Congress will return to our American values and stand proudly for the principles of family reunification—the family unit as the core of American society, communities, and our country—that have guided U.S. immigration policies for the last century. It is the very family reunification that ultimately allowed Donald Trump's grandfather to come to the United States and have his progeny come from there and ultimately rise to be the President of the United States.

I am going to fight for the parents of Dreamers and the comprehensive immigration reform we need when that day comes, but for the moment, I am under no illusions. The cold, hard reality is that in 2 weeks the dreams of hundreds of thousands of innocent children and promising young people will be extinguished, and that is why we must act.

To my friends in the immigration advocacy community, as well as my Democratic colleagues, I remind you that legislating is the art of the possible. We are in the minority in both Chambers of Congress. The opposing party occupies the White House. We may not enjoy this reality—I certainly don't—but it is a reality nonetheless. And in this reality, we do not have the power to make anything happen unless we get support from some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We have the power to try and stop terrible things from happening, but we can make things happen only if we have others join us in common cause.

So I ask my fellow Democrats to please hold the line for the hundreds of thousands of innocent children and bright, young people who belong in this country and need our votes to stay in this country. We have to remember that compromise is the oil that keeps the wheels of Congress running, and, without it, Dreamers who have become integral to communities across the Nation may very well be forcibly removed. We know they belong here with us, strengthening the diverse threads that bind us together as one people.

To my Republican colleagues, I ask you to remember the tough concessions we have had to make so that Dreamers have a chance to earn citizenship in a country they love and the only country they know.

I again close by quoting the always relevant and forever wise Dr. King, who said:

> We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history there is such a thing as being too late.

My friends, the fierce urgency of now looms over us today. The fate of our Dreamers grows more uncertain with each passing second. I, for one, refuse to let their dreams die here on the Senate floor.

Let's pass the Rounds-King amendment and pass it fast. There is no time for further delay. If we want Dreamers

to have a tomorrow here in this country, then we must act today.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I come to the floor now to offer brief remarks on the introduction of the latest so-called bipartisan proposal. There is simply no way to say it, but to say it: This proposal fails to meet the mark, will result in massive amnesty, and will result in a surge of illegal immigration, even encouraging the illegal crossing of our borders. It has absolutely no chance of becoming law because we have been reminded of what the President has said he would sign, and he has said that this bill we are talking about now would not be signed by the President of the United States. It would be vetoed.

In my mind, the Department of Homeland Security, when they commented on this bill, has this one point right. This bill will absolutely destroy our ability—meaning the ability of DHS—to enforce our laws, secure our borders, and then, consequentially, not protect the American people. The American people expect our government to fulfill their No. 1 responsibility, which is to protect the American people.

It is hard to decide where to start when you dissect this ill-conceived proposal, but to quote, I think, J.R.R. Tolkien, I guess the best place to begin is at the beginning. This proposal claims to have border security measures, but the simple fact is that it doesn't have border security measures. This proposal does something that Democrats and Republicans agreed last year isn't sufficient border security, and we have all agreed that simply throwing money at the border is not border security. So what does that lead you to, other than just what you do at the border?

Everyone in this Chamber knows how hard Senators CORNYN and JOHNSON have worked on border security. Their hard work has shown all of us that real border security isn't just about infrastructure and money; it is about legal authority policy changes, as well, which may be more important. Like it or not, the simple fact is that our current laws contain numerous loopholes that actually prevent our law enforcement officers from apprehending, detaining, and speedily deporting dangerous criminal aliens.

Professional staffers at the Department of Homeland Security—and I emphasize the words ''professional staffers,'' not political employees—all agree we need these authority changes.

I ask my colleagues: What is the point of throwing money at the border if sex offenders, terrorists, gang members, child molesters, and war criminals can continue getting into our country? What is the point if we can't actually remove people who are entering illegally? What is the point if Americans continue to be victimized by crimes committed by undocumented immigrants?

This bipartisan plan falls miserably short of providing real border security and doesn't do anything to make Americans safer.

Worse than the border security problems, this bipartisan plan massively expands the number of individuals who are eligible for citizenship. The way this plan is written, more than 3 million individuals could become eligible for citizenship, and many of these people wouldn't be the very same people we have been trying to deal with all week—DACA and Dreamers.

The way this bill is written, people as old as 43 could benefit. I thought when we began this debate we were talking about protecting young people, not middle-aged adults. This is clearly beyond the pale and is just another example of moving the amnesty yardstick.

But the worst thing in this plan, the most egregious thing, is that it effectively suspends immigration enforcement until June 2018. Think about that. Why would you effectively suspend immigration enforcement at any time? If my colleagues look at the last page of this amendment, it clearly says that any person who illegally enters our country before the end of June 2018 will never be a priority for deportation. Think of the invitation that comes for people between now and June 30 to get to this country because they won't be a priority for deportation. Isn't that quite an invitation to violate our laws, to violate our sovereignty? I can't imagine that people in the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota—any State, for that matter, but particularly in some of these really conservative States—that they would be thinking about voting for something that would actually be inviting people to this country because they won't be a priority for deportation. Let that point sink in.

The authors of this plan are telling everyone in the world—not just south of our border—no matter who they are, what they have done, that if they get here before June, they will never be an enforcement priority. Isn't that immigration madness? I can't, for the life of me, understand why my colleagues would want to end immigration enforcement. What justification do they have?

I would urge them that if they have justification, please come to the floor and please explain to the American people why you want people who aren't already here to come illegally. What could be the reason for that?

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. It just isn't serious and will totally undermine our Nation's border security and immigration laws. This should not pass. I hope it doesn't pass. The President has proposed a veto.

For the people who introduced it, it is a good bill, but are you interested in a good bill or are you interested in getting a law passed? That takes 60 in the Senate, takes a majority in the House, and takes a Presidential signature. I hope you are serious about working for things that can actually become law. That is what we have promised the Dreamers. That is what we can deliver if we get those 60 votes. We can do it in a way that is sound immigration policy, not something that is going to encourage more people to cross our borders without documentation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Colorado.

HONORING SHERIFF'S DEPUTY MICAH FLICK

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, yesterday America witnessed another great tragedy in the State of Florida, and of course our souls ache with what must be unimaginable grief. As we turn to comfort those who lost so much in Florida, I come to the floor of the Senate again, for the third time in a little more than a month, to share the grief of Colorado, as well as to honor the life and legacy of a fallen Colorado sheriff's deputy.

El Paso County Sheriff's Deputy Micah Flick was shot and killed last week while investigating a stolen car when he threw himself in front of his fellow officers to shield them from gunfire. Sheriff's Deputy Scott Stone, Sheriff's Sergeant Jacob Abendschan, and Colorado Springs Police Officer Marcus Yanez, along with a bystander, were also wounded in the attack.

A total of 10 law enforcement officers in Colorado have been wounded or killed since December 31. On January 24, Adams County Sheriff's Deputy Gumm was fatally wounded. Another assault on law enforcement officers on New Year's Eve in Douglas County resulted in the death of Jefferson County Sheriff's Deputy Parrish and wounded four other law enforcement officers.

These three attacks left four children without fathers and countless loved ones with a loss they will never forget.

Micah Flick was killed on his 11th anniversary with the El Paso County Sheriff's Department and leaves behind a wife and 7-year-old twins.

Micah was a hero who, according to the Colorado Springs Gazette, was remembered by his brother-in-law as someone who ''never wanted to do anything else but protect this community.'' His fellow sheriff's deputies would always tease him that he was ''the poster boy of the sheriff's office.''

Micah's wife Rachel captured her husband's heroism perfectly when she explained how she would always tell him to just do his job and not be a hero but understands that was not in his DNA. ''Micah was a hero, and he couldn't help it,'' she said. Micah's fellow deputy who was wounded in the attack confirmed Micah's heroism. Deputy Stone told Sheriff Bill Elder: ''Micah saved my life, and I will be forever grateful.'' Micah was a hero that day, and no one will ever forget that.

Unfortunately, I have come to this Chamber far too many times just this year to honor a fallen Colorado law enforcement officer and repeat the words

for the third time of LTC Dave Grossman, who wrote that American law enforcement is the loyal and brave sheep dog, always standing watch for the wolf that lurks in the dark.

We owe so much to Micah and his brothers and sisters in blue who protect our communities each and every day. I know that all of our families together sleep better at night knowing these heroes are out protecting every single one of us.

Thank you, Micah, for answering the call. You protected your community. You saved your fellow officers. You are a hero. And I, along with Coloradans across the State, am forever grateful. Like your fellow officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice, we will remember your heroism for eternity and honor you and your family for your sacrifice.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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. COTTON. 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. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to speak today about the so-called Schumer amendment. Now, that is not the name that some people give it, but I will give it that name. Abraham Lincoln said: If you call a dog's tail a leg, how many legs has a dog? Five? No, it has four, because calling something doesn't make it that.

In the same way, you can call a bill bipartisan because there are some Republicans on that bill, but if the Republicans have simply acquiesced to the Democrats' position, it is a Democratic bill. Calling it bipartisan doesn't make it so.

Let's just walk through a few of the weaknesses of this bill.

No. 1 is the enforcement holiday for illegal immigration. You might call it the ''olly olly oxen free'' position. That is because it declares to anyone, worldwide, if you get to the United States in the next four months, or before June 30, 2018, olly olly oxen free, the Department of Homeland Security will not enforce our laws against you.

Don't take my word for it. Look at it right here. In fact, it was done in handwriting last night. I suspect some of my Republican colleagues on this bill didn't even know that this change was made. It used to be January 1, 2018, and you had to be present for at least 5½ years. That is not great, but it is better than a prospective enforcement holiday that says that if you get to this country illegally in the next 4 months, we will not make you an enforcement priority. So come on in, everyone. If you get here by June 30, under this amendment, the Department of Homeland Security will not make it a priority to enforce our laws against you.

No. 2, let's look at the amnesty that it provides. The President has been extraordinarily generous in his offer to our Democratic colleagues. He didn't say a legal status for 690,000 people who are enrolled in the Obama-era DACA Program. He said citizenship. He said a full opportunity for citizenship for 1.8 million people—1.8 million people—who were not just enrolled in the program but would have been eligible for the program had they enrolled.

This amendment would expand that to almost 3 million to 4 million people by lifting the age limits and by lifting the age caps—a vast amnesty, just among those younger people, of a quarter of the people who are here in this country illegally.

It gets even worse than that.

No. 3, the entire rationale of the DACA Program is that children ought not pay for the sins of their parents. How about the parents pay for the sins of the parents? This bill would allow the effective legalization of the very parents who created this problem in the first place. The sponsors of this amendment will say: No, no, we prohibit the parents from getting legal status. Let's look at how they do that. They say that no person can receive legal status if the Department of Homeland Security can show they knowingly assisted the entry of a minor into this country. Tell me how the Department of Homeland Security is supposed to make that showing. How are they supposed to go back 10, 15, 20, 25 years and show that this illegal immigrant knowingly brought that person into this country? It is preposterous. It is the exact reason why so many immigration bills have failed for so many years in this body—the Democrats write bills they claim do one thing; in reality, they do the exact opposite.

No. 4, they say that it reforms chain migration or at least makes a downpayment on it. Here is what it actually does. It briefly delays a tiny, tiny class of persons from being sponsored by newly legalized immigrants—only about 25,000 per year of the adult children of green card holders. It takes those and applies them to the other adult children, and when those immigrants become citizens—guess what—they get to sponsor their adult children again. So it does not make a single change to the practice of extended family chain migration, which is responsible for so much of the unskilled and low-skilled immigration we have had in this country over the last 40 years.

It makes no changes whatsoever to the diversity lottery, not a single one, even though every other provision under serious consideration has at least eliminated that lottery and reallocated those green cards toward other purposes, such as clearing out the family-based backlog and clearing out the high-skilled backlog.

Some people say that it appropriates $25 billion—$2.5 billion a year for 10 years—for the border wall. It does no such thing. Again, it says one thing and does another. It gives $2.5 billion for the first year. It can't be spent on physical barriers. Then, every year after that, it makes that money contingent on a report and a certification by the Department of Homeland Security that is purposefully onerous, difficult to achieve, and therefore means the money likely will not be available in future years. And, of course, if a Democratic President comes into office during the 10 years of this bill, we know that his Department of Homeland Security will never submit that report certification, and that money will never be spent.

Finally, No. 5, this amendment has no chance of becoming law—zero chance. It shouldn't pass this Chamber to begin with, but even if that were to happen, President Trump issued a veto threat just minutes ago. The House of Representatives is not going to pass this bill. They probably will not even take it up, as they didn't take it up the last time the Senate passed a terrible immigration bill.

My friends, this Democratic bill deserves to be roundly defeated.

There is one bill that has a chance to pass the House of Representatives and get the President's signature; that is, the President's framework proposal, which, in a very generous and humane fashion, gives citizenship—not just legal status but citizenship—to 1.8 million young people who were brought here or came here before the age of accountability.

On the other hand, it mitigates the negative consequences of that decision, which we all know will happen.

First, to control the increased incentives for illegal immigration, it provides the money and closes the loopholes necessary to secure our southern border.

Second, to prevent that newly legalized class of citizens from sponsoring the very parents who created this problem in the first place and their siblings and ultimately their grandparents, their aunts and uncles, cousins, and their nieces and nephews, it ends the practice of extended family chain migration and says that American citizens can always sponsor their spouses and their minor kids, but anyone else, any other adult, should stand on their own two feet if they want to immigrate to this country.

That is what the President said he will sign. That is, therefore, what the House of Representatives can pass. That is the bill that should pass today—the bill that is sponsored by Chairman GRASSLEY of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, 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.

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.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to emphasize why the Secure and Succeed Act is the right bill for the Senate to pass this week. I chose to join my colleagues, who have worked hard on this bill for months, for a few important reasons.

First, this bill provides a way forward for our DACA recipients. I have said time and again that I appreciate the contributions our DACA recipients are making in our communities. They are our friends, our neighbors, and our churchgoers. I support finding them a way forward. Our bill does this. It does it in a fair and humane way. But importantly, it also adds strong eligibility requirements to ensure the safety and security of the program and stops future illegal immigration. For instance, it does not reward the parents who came here illegally by giving them any type of lawful status and sets reasonable time limits and restrictions on who can apply.

Second, it provides immediate and significant investments in our border. We cannot allow this problem to happen again. We have a duty and an obligation to keep our borders secure and our citizens safe. Our bill recognizes that spending money on the border without giving law enforcement strong authorities is like buying a boat without an engine. We need both to keep our borders and our communities secure.

Third, our bill recognizes that you cannot view immigration in a silo—it is a bulky issue that represents many legal, economic, and security concerns. Many of these issues are deeply interconnected. Addressing DACA and addressing the border without addressing some of the other issues plaguing our system is a half solution. We must have the President's four principles to make this work.

Finally, this is the President's plan. The White House has endorsed this proposal. The President's pen is ready to sign it.

I urge my colleagues, let's pass the bill that addresses the right issues in this debate and can actually become law. Let's pass the Secure and Succeed Act.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during yesterday's session of the Senate ripen at 2:30 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority whip.

SOUTH FLORIDA SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today we mourn the loss of life of at least 17 people at the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School near Fort Lauderdale, FL. We are reminded that when we are asked to do something, there are things we can do to help lessen the likelihood of such terrible tragedies, recognizing that each of these circumstances is unique, and we don't yet know everything that there is to know or that we should know about this particular shooter. Suffice it to say, he telegraphed on social media, according to reports, his intention to do what he ultimately did.

We in Congress, the policymakers, need to come up with tools to be available to law enforcement and the social media platforms to be able to monitor these sort of terroristic threats much in the same way we monitor social media for al-Qaida and ISIS and other terrorists abroad who try to recruit people in the United States in order to kill our fellow citizens in place. We need to not only think about and pray for the families and teachers and support staff who have been affected by this terrible act but conduct hearings and talk to the experts and find out what kind of tools might be available to us.

I will mention another example of something we could do that would, I am confident, save lives.

In my home State of Texas only a few months ago, we saw a mass shooting in a small town called Sutherland Springs, which is near San Antonio. The gunman there killed 26 people and wounded 20 more. He was a convicted felon. Under existing law, he could not legally purchase or possess firearms, but that didn't stop him from getting the weapons he used to murder those 26 people and shoot 20 more. Part of the reason was, his criminal history had not been uploaded to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, which is maintained by the FBI. So the gun retailer, when he had gone in and lied on the background check document, hadn't known he had been legally disqualified from purchasing a firearm.

I have introduced legislation to try to fix that specific problem. It is called the Fix NICS Act. The House has already passed it, but it is awaiting action in the Senate.

Our churches and schools should be refuges—places where parents and children, especially, feel safe and secure. Many of these shootings can be prevented, perhaps not all, but we need to do everything we can. Part of the way we can ensure that our children are protected is to enforce current law—and not just our children but adults as well, as we saw in Sutherland Springs. We can fix our broken background check system and prohibit dangerous individuals who have been convicted of serious crimes from acquiring firearms legally.

As I said, we don't know all of the facts of the Florida shooting, and the circumstances, as is almost always the case, appear to be a little cloudy right now. It may be we will find out there are some clues that this shooter had been sending well in advance of this terrible tragedy that might have prevented it from occurring.

There is no reason we cannot advance this bipartisan legislation, the Fix NICS legislation, which has already passed in the House. I, personally, am unwilling to face another family member who has lost a loved one as a result of one of these mass shootings that could have been prevented by making sure the background check system had worked as Congress had intended.

Mr. President, on a separate note, this week, a group led by Chairman GRASSLEY of the Senate Judiciary Committee formally introduced a bill to address the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals issue and border security. It is a good starting point because it could actually be signed into law and solve the challenge we have promised to address in providing these young people who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in a box. Because they cannot become American citizens due to the fact that their parents brought them into the country illegally, it would provide them a predictable and productive future. I am glad to be a cosponsor of this legislation, which is called the Secure and Succeed Act.

As the President has promised, it does provide a pathway to citizenship for an estimated 1.8 million people who are DACA-eligible. That is an extraordinary offer by the President of the United States. Who would have ever thought this President would say to these young people, ''We are going to give you a chance to become American citizens''? That number is far more than those who were covered by the Executive order that was signed by President Obama because, right now, there are only about 690,000—I say ''only''—DACA recipients. President Trump would make it 1.8 million.

Just as importantly, this bill provides a real plan to strengthen border security by utilizing more boots on the ground, better technology, and additional infrastructure, and it enhances and modernizes our ports of entry through which many of the illegal drugs come that flow into this country from the south.

This bill reallocates visas from the diversity lottery system, which is just sort of like a roll of the dice, but it will do it in a way that is fair, and it continues the family-based immigration categories until the current backlog is cleared.

I know other colleagues have been working hard on their own ideas, some of which were introduced yesterday and earlier this morning, but one group I haven't heard much from so far is that of our colleagues across the aisle who shut down the government over the weekend a couple of weeks ago because they insisted we provide a time to address this issue.

Indeed, in response, once they agreed to reopen the government, the majority leader offered them that time and that opportunity, and that is this week. Yet, so far, none of our Democratic colleagues have even produced a bill. Rather, the bill has been produced by Senator GRASSLEY and his working group I mentioned. There is another bill by Senator COLLINS and Senator ROUNDS, which we will be voting on here shortly. Then, I believe, Senator GARDNER and Senator BENNET have another proposal. The very folks who shut down the government over this issue have failed to produce a plan in response to this demand that we have a debate and that we have a vote to try to address the problem.

On Tuesday, the majority leader tried twice to open the debate and start voting, but, both times, there were objections heard by our Democratic colleagues—this despite their repeated promises over the years to address the DACA issue once and for all. Now the clock has run so we can finally get started, and we will start voting, as I understand the majority leader's unanimous consent request, at about 2:30 today. We are just getting started in our voting due to the stalling and the lack of, really, much debate. Certainly, there have been no substantive offers up until this point from our colleagues across the aisle.

I believe sincerely that Republicans and Democrats alike want to provide certainty to these DACA recipients, but we have to address the underlying problems with our border security and our flawed immigration system as well.

I know our colleague from Pennsylvania has introduced an amendment to end dangerous sanctuary city policies. It is simply unacceptable for local jurisdictions to decide they are not going to cooperate with Federal law enforcement agencies. We are a nation, and we are a nation of laws, so the idea that some local group could decide not to cooperate with Federal law enforcement authorities ought to worry all of us.

Even though this amendment has been endorsed by the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association and the National Association of Police Organizations, many of our colleagues across the aisle will probably vote against it. That is especially odd since some of them voted to advance a similar sanctuary city measure themselves in 2015.

Even more of our Democratic colleagues voted to advance what is known as Kate's Law in 2016. It is named for Kate Steinle, the young woman who was murdered in San Francisco by an illegal immigrant who had been released from custody. Kate's Law would stiffen penalties for illegal immigrants who have been caught entering the country repeatedly, as her killer had done. What is controversial about that? If you break the law repeatedly and we find you, there should be very serious consequences. Perhaps Kate Steinle would be alive today had that been the case before her untimely death.

I don't know why our Democratic colleagues refuse to vote for these and other related proposals. I really don't get it. Yet I do know one thing that is worth highlighting: Their unwillingness to support reforms represents a stark departure from what they have said in the past.

For example, in 2006, the senior Senator from California said: ''Democrats are solidly behind controlling the border, and we support the border fence. . . . We've got to get tough on the border.'' She was then joined by then-Senator Harry Reid, who had made similar statements.

The senior Senator from Colorado has said the Democrats still believe in border security. That is good to hear. I wish their actions reflected that.

In recent years, the junior Senator from New Mexico has said: ''It is critical we have the personnel, equipment, and policies in place that focus enforcement on the most significant public safety threats along the border.'' I could not have said that better myself, but when it comes time to vote, strangely, almost uniformly, our colleagues vote no.

I agree with our colleague from Indiana as well, who went down to the border a while back and said he had seen for himself just how bad the situation was in certain areas. That is why he voted to hire more border agents, penalize businesses that hire illegal immigrants, and deport those who commit felonies.

My point is, we should all remember we are not as far apart as the press would seem to make it. Now it is time to advance the bill to that effect—not next time, not next month, not next year. We know the clock is ticking. The President has given us until March 5 to get this done, but if this week is any indication, our colleagues on the other side don't seem to be in any particular hurry.

As the majority leader said earlier this week, we need to stop making political points and start making a law. That means passing it out of the Senate, passing it out of the House, and getting the President to sign it into law. That is how you make law. Several weeks ago, as I said, the majority leader made a commitment to hold this debate and to hold it this week. He has lived up to that commitment, and now we can't let it all just go to waste and squander this opportunity.

I am really shocked by that after the President made this offer of a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million young adults who were brought into this country as children illegally by their parents. I have always said we don't hold children responsible for their parents' mistakes. That is why we should embrace this proposal by the President. I don't know how you tell these young people we had the opportunity to address their anxiety and the uncertainty in their futures by passing a bill that encompasses the President's proposal and gives them a pathway to citizenship. How do you look them in their faces and say we squandered this golden opportunity, maybe a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity?

That is what this week is about. There are about 124,000 DACA recipients in my State of Texas, and I will proudly cast a vote soon to ensure that they stay here and contribute to our schools, our churches, and our communities. We are a nation of immigrants, but we are also a nation of laws, and you cannot have one without the other.

What this week is about is finding a bipartisan permanent solution for these young adults but doing more than just that. I, certainly, respect that some of our colleagues have introduced thoughtful ideas, but we have to remember that, ultimately, we need to move a bill through the Senate that can pass not only this body but the House and be signed into law by the President.

This is not about grandstanding or making a political point. The idea is to produce a result, one that we have all said we want. So let's not waste any more time. Let's send the House and then the President something that can become law and provide certainty to these young people who are worried about their future and regain our legacy as a nation that believes in the rule of law and security for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, in the late 1980s, Congress debated and adopted amnesty legislation for 3 million people who were here illegally. It did so promising the American people that in exchange for amnesty, the Federal Government would finally, finally, finally secure the border. We all know what happened. That amnesty occurred, and the border never got secured. At the time, there were 3 million people living here illegally. Today, estimates are that there are in excess of 12 million people living here illegally.

Five years ago, in 2013, this body again debated amnesty. The so-called Gang of 8 again failed to secure the border but once again made the same promise of amnesty for millions here illegally in exchange for an ephemeral, never-to-come promise to secure the border. The Senate ultimately passed the Gang of 8 bill. As it was being voted on, Senate Democrats bragged on television that they believed they had north of 70 votes—that now was the time, again, to pass amnesty.

Yet the American people rose up and said: Amnesty is not what we want. It is inconsistent with the rule of law. We saw Senators at the last minute jumping ship. At the end of the day, it passed this body by 68 votes and then went nowhere in the House of Representatives.

So again, today, we are here having the same debate. I feel like Bill Murray

in ''Groundhog Day,'' waking up and reliving the same day over and over and over, and the result is the same.

Listen, I don't know how these votes will occur this afternoon. It may be that nothing gets 60 votes. That is possible. But it may also be that the Senate embraces one of the various amnesty plans that is put on the table. If that is the case, it will be every bit as big a mistake as the Gang of 8 was a mistake and as the amnesty in the 1980s was a mistake. I must say that I find myself flabbergasted at where my own party is in this debate, because every proposal that has Republican support that has been submitted begins from a place markedly to the left of that of President Obama.

President Obama, as we all know, issued DACA, which was otherwise known as Executive amnesty. Executive amnesty was illegal and unconstitutional. The President has no authority to refuse to enforce the law. Yet President Obama decreed that he would not enforce Federal immigration laws, and that is exactly what he did.

At the time, virtually every Republican denounced Executive amnesty as unconstitutional, as lawless, as wrong. Yet today, far too many Senate Republicans are staking out a place well to the left of President Obama on DACA on numerous axes. No. 1, DACA itself covered 690,000 people. Yet what is the proposal being considered by this body? Under the mildest of the proposals, we are considering a path to citizenship for 1.8 million people. Why on Earth would we more than double—nearly triple—the DACA population? If there are 690,000 people who received illegal and unconstitutional Executive amnesty, then, it seems to me that, at the very most, the population we should consider is those 690,000.

The argument is made that they have relied on this promise, even though the promise was illegal and even though it was unconstitutional. The people who relied on this promise are the 690,000, not the 1.1 million who never even applied.

So I would ask why Republicans—and, indeed, why Democrats—are nearly tripling what President Obama did in DACA. But that is not the only regard. DACA never included citizenship. Nothing in President Obama's DACA allowed citizenship. Nothing in it allowed a path to citizenship. DACA was a work permit, nothing more than a work permit—an illegal work permit, mind you—but it did not allow citizenship. Yet today far too many Republicans are eager to embrace the Democrats' demands that 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 million people here illegally should be granted a path to citizenship. That is wrong. That is plain and simple wrong. It is unfair to the millions of working men and women. It is unfair to the steelworkers, the truckdrivers, and the mechanics. It is unfair to millions of American citizens, working men and women, who faced stagnant wages under President Obama. It is unfair to millions of legal immigrants whose wages are driven down by those here illegally. It is inconsistent with the promises made by virtually every Republican in this body.

Every Republican who went out and campaigned against Executive amnesty said: We will not have amnesty. Well, now is the time to choose. If this body chooses to grant citizenship to 2, 3, 4 million people here illegally, those promises will have been directly broken. That is a mistake. It is wrong. Not only that, but the legislation this body is preparing to consider not only would grant citizenship, but it would make those here illegally eligible for Federal welfare—Federal welfare benefits. Not only do people come here illegally, but it drives up the cost.

Every one of us has been asked by American citizens: Why are we spending vast sums of money providing welfare benefits? Why would we want to do that to those here illegally?

We are a nation of immigrants. My father came as an immigrant in 1957 with nothing—$100 in his underwear and not speaking English—but he came legally. We should be embracing legal immigrants rather than excusing and condoning illegal immigration.

I do not believe we should be granting citizenship to anyone here illegally, nor should we be providing Federal welfare benefits to anyone here illegally, nor should we be expanding the pool of DACA recipients beyond that in the Obama program. Yet Republicans seem eager to do so. It is possible that our Democratic friends will save us from this foolishness—that even though Republicans are proposing a profoundly foolhardy immigration proposal, the Democrats will decide they want even more. There is not enough amnesty that the Democrats could take. If they do that, that will save the day for now. But if not, if this body gets 60 votes for one of these amnesty proposals, then it is incumbent on the House to stop it, much like with the Gang of 8.

In the Gang of 8, the Senate couldn't stop it. The Senate has always, unfortunately, been very liberal on immigration. It has been very willing to make promises to the voters and promptly come down here and vote very differently from those promises. But the House of Representatives—the People's House—is designed to be responsive to the people. So it is my hope that House conservatives, facing the people and listening to the people, will recognize that we had an election in 2014 in response to the Gang of 8. The American people said: We don't want the Gang of 8. They elected the largest House majority of Republicans in 70 years. They elected 9 new Republicans in the Senate and retired Harry Reid as majority leader. Yet, somehow, Republicans in this body didn't hear the voters in 2014. We had an election in 2016 that the media was ready to call for Hillary Clinton. Yet, front and center in the 2016 election, was the American people saying: We don't want amnesty.

My call to our colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, is listen to the people.

There are many things we can and should be doing. We should be passing Kate's Law. I authored and introduced Kate's Law in this body. Kate's Law provides that for an aggravated felon who has been repeatedly entering this country illegally and who has been deported repeatedly, that that aggravated felon have a mandatory minimum prison sentence. Kate's Law is known for Kate Steinle, that beautiful woman in California murdered on a pier by an illegal alien deported over and over with multiple felony convictions. Had Kate's Law been on the books, I believe it is very likely that Kate Steinle would still be alive. That is the sort of commonsense legislation on which we ought to be coming together and passing. Yet there is the old adage: Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

This body made a grievous mistake in passing the Gang of 8 bill. Thankfully, the House saved us from our error. We may be on the verge of making the same grievous mistake. It is almost as if elections don't penetrate. We need to be listening to the voters.

I do not know a single Republican—not one in this body, not one in the House of Representatives—who was elected on a promise: I will go to the left of Barack Obama on immigration.

If one of us campaigned promising that, knock yourself out. Vote for this. But if you didn't say that Obama's Executive amnesty didn't go far enough, that we need to double or triple the pool, that we need to grant citizenship because Obama was too much of a conservative on immigration—if you didn't say that—then the only vote consistent with what we told the voters is to vote no today. We can come together and find commonsense solutions on immigration. We can secure the border. We can triple the Border Patrol. We can end catch and release. We can implement a strong E-verify. We can use strong tools and technology. We can continue to embrace and celebrate legal immigrants, and we can do all of that while respecting the rule of law.

What I would urge my colleagues to do is very simple. Ask yourself what you told the voters before election, and let your conduct after election day match what you told the voters.

As for the Democrats, the Democrats campaigned as the party of amnesty. They are at least being true to their promises. They promised amnesty. That is their priority. They are being true. But for Republicans, we promised something different. We promised to stand with the working men and women, the union members, the steelworkers, the men and women with calluses on their hands.

I urge every one of us to listen to the working men and women, to respect the rule of law, and to vote against these misguided proposals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes before we proceed to the cloture vote scheduled at 2:30 p.m.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1955

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I was honored when my good friend Senator JOHN MCCAIN reached out to me 2 weeks ago to suggest that we introduce bipartisan legislation here in the Senate that would attempt to solve two of our most pressing immigration issues and keep our country and Congress moving forward. The bill we have introduced—and which the Senate will soon proceed to vote on—doesn't solve every immigration issue we face, and it doesn't try to. What our bill does is focus on the issues on which we can agree. It is an attempt to break through the messy political debates and substantive disagreements here and find compromise.

Our bill would do two simple things: Move to secure our border, and finally give Dreamers the path to citizenship they deserve.

First, to address border security, our bipartisan bill would ensure that we gain operational control of the border by 2020 with new investments, new technology, new resources for Federal, State, and local law enforcement. It would also reduce current immigration court backlogs by funding new judges and attorneys, while addressing one of the root causes of immigration from Central America.

Second, our bill would give legal certainty to 1.8 million Dreamers who are American in every way but the paperwork—young Americans who have known no other country but this one. Dreamers who continue to play by the rules by going to school, serving in our military, and maintaining consistent employment can become lawful permanent residents and, 5 years later, U.S. citizens.

Senator MCCAIN and I aren't the only ones who think this bipartisan solution makes sense; 54 Members of the House—an even split of 27 Republicans and 27 Democrats—have cosponsored and led this effort. It has been championed by Republican Congressman WILL HURD of Texas, whose district has 800 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border, and Democratic Congressman PETE AGUILAR of California.

Our bill is more than just a set of policies. It is a way for us to agree when we can agree and not let our disagreements get in the way of making progress. There have been misrepresentations and half-truths said in attacking this bill, and I will simply say this: Would a true American hero and patriot like Senator MCCAIN have lent his name to this bill if all these attacks were true? I think not.

Our message is simple. We may not fix every immigration issue right now, but we can take a historic step forward, and with new technology, new manpower, a new pathway to citizenship, address Dreamers and allow them to succeed in American schools and in the American military and to enrich American communities without fear of deportation. These are tough issues, but the solution is simple. I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the McCain-Coons bill.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 1955 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

Angus S. King, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Heidi Heitkamp, Joe Donnelly, Tim Kaine, Mark R. Warner, Sheldon Whitehouse, Debbie Stabenow, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jeanne Shaheen, Jack Reed, Tammy Baldwin, Patty Murray, Edward J. Markey, Amy Klobuchar, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer.

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 amendment No. 1955, offered by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, for the Senator from Delaware, Mr. COONS, to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage, 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).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Jones	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Smith
Casey	King	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Tester
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Murkowski	Wyden
Gardner	Murphy	
Gillibrand	Murray	

NAYS—47

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Enzi	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 47.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to each remaining vote in this series; finally, that any further vote in the series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1948 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Thune, Cory Gardner, Lindsey Graham, Bob Corker, James Lankford, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Lamar Alexander, Steve Daines, Shelley Moore Capito, Dan Sullivan.

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 amendment No. 1948, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, for the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY, to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage, shall be brought to a close?

There is 2 minutes of debate.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, Kate Steinle didn't have to be shot and killed on a pier in San Francisco. A 13-year-old child didn't have to be raped in the city of Philadelphia by Ramon Ochoa. Both of those crimes were committed by people who were in this country illegally after previously committing multiple crimes and after having been deported. In both cases, the

cities in which these crimes occurred—the police departments—had these criminals in custody shortly prior to the commission of these crimes. But in both cases, when the Department of Homeland Security asked for a temporary detention until they could take these people into custody and deport them, that was not allowed because these were sanctuary cities. These sanctuary cities systematically forbid the local police from even sharing information or cooperating with Federal immigration officials, even in the case of criminals.

My amendment is a bipartisan amendment. I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia for cosponsoring it. This is an amendment that will ensure that any legal liability for wrongful detention is held by the Federal Government, and nonsecurity funds—CDBG grants and some other categories—will be withheld from sanctuary cities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Toomey amendment will withhold critical funding from cities, counties, and States whose police departments refuse to deploy their police officers as immigration agents for the Federal Government.

Listen to what the two chiefs of police in Storm Lake and Marshalltown, IA, wrote last week to the Des Moines Register:

> Most significant, the proposed bill would diminish the trust that keeps our cities safe in the first place. We depend on residents, including immigrants, to come to us when they see something suspicious or potentially criminal. If they hear of a looming ''crackdown'' that could affect their families and friends, they are less likely to come [forward] to report and prevent actual crimes.

This is from Iowa chiefs of police in the Midwest. It is common sense.

My superintendent in Chicago, EDDIE JOHNSON, said:

> I've said it before and I'll say it again. Undocumented immigrants are not driving violence in Chicago. That's why I want our officers focused on community policing and not trying to be immigration police.

Vote for our men and women in uniform. Vote against the Toomey amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

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).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Blunt	Burr
Barrasso	Boozman	Capito
Cassidy	Grassley	Perdue
Cochran	Hatch	Portman
Collins	Heller	Risch
Corker	Hoeven	Roberts
Cornyn	Inhofe	Rounds
Cotton	Isakson	Rubio
Crapo	Johnson	Sasse
Cruz	Kennedy	Scott
Daines	Lankford	Shelby
Donnelly	Lee	Stabenow
Enzi	Manchin	Sullivan
Ernst	McCaskill	Thune
Fischer	McConnell	Tillis
Flake	Moran	Toomey
Gardner	Murkowski	Wicker
Graham	Paul	Young

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Harris	Nelson
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Jones	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant 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 Senate amendment No. 1958, as modified, to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Thune, Cory Gardner, Lindsey Graham, Bob Corker, James Lankford, Lisa Murkowski, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Lamar Alexander, Steve Daines, Shelley Moore Capito.

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 amendment No. 1958, as modified, offered by the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage, shall be brought to a close?

There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I know there is some dispute about the name of this amendment, so let's just call it the ''olly olly oxen free'' amendment because it says to the entire world: If you can get to our country in the next 4 months, olly olly oxen free—you can stay forever.

That is right. This bill directs the Department of Homeland Security not to prioritize enforcement action not only against illegal immigrants here today but anyone who gets here over the next 4 months.

Second, it is an amnesty that is far broader than the DACA Program—not 700,000, not 1.8 million, but over 3 million people.

Third, it is even worse than that because it includes their parents as well. The bill purports to prohibit parents from being legalized, but it requires the Federal Government to show that the parents did not knowingly assist the entry of a minor into this country. How can the government show that 15, 20, 25 years later? And to say nothing of the fact that it puts onerous conditions on the spending of any money for security. It does virtually nothing for chain migration and nothing at all to the diversity lottery. That is why President Trump has issued a veto threat, and that is why every one of my colleagues should vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, while I enjoy the humor that my colleague from Arkansas has expressed, this is an important bill. What we have done is what the President has asked for.

No. 1, this provides $25 billion for a border security system.

No. 2, it addresses the issue of DACA. It takes care of 1.8 million young people who want to be citizens of the United States 10 to 12 years from now. It does not provide a citizenship opportunity for their parents.

I yield at this time to my colleague, the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on January 9 of this year, the President of the United States said: We are going to come up with DACA. We are going to do DACA, and then we can start immediately on phase two, which will be comprehensive. I think we have to do DACA first. Later that evening, he tweeted and said that in addition to DACA, we need to do the border. This is that bill.

Much of the criticism are for things not in this bill. They weren't intended to be. This is a narrow bill dealing with DACA and border security. This is what the American people want us to do, and they are going to be puzzled if anyone in this body votes against a bill that will deal with DACA and border security.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues, Senator ROUNDS and Senator KING, in clarifying the intent of a provision from the Immigration Security and Opportunity Act, which has been offered as an amendment. What this provision seeks to do is send a strong message to people who come to the country after the bill is enacted that they are going to be a priority for deportation just like a person

who has committed a felony is prioritized for deportation. I commit to changing this date from June 30, 2018, back to the beginning of the calendar year, January 1, 2018, in conference should the amendment be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I agree with the senior Senator from Maine on the intent of this provision and support working with her and our colleagues to move this date to January 1, 2018. I would also offer that to prioritize some actions does not mean to do so at the exclusion of others, nor does it mean that DHS is prohibited in any way from enforcing the law.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I, too, would like to echo the comments by Senator COLLINS and Senator KING on the intent of the provision and our commitment to move this date back to the beginning of the year. This provision is needed to ensure that we are providing a deterrent. Individuals who come to the U.S. after a particular date must know that we are going to focus resources on their deportation just like we will focus on felons and other criminals and those who pose a threat to our Nation's security or public safety.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Gardner	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Graham	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Heitkamp	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Jones	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Shaheen
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Harris	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heinrich	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Corker	Inhofe	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kennedy	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1959 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Thune, Cory Gardner, Lindsey Graham, Bob Corker, James Lankford, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Lamar Alexander, Steve Daines, Shelley Moore Capito, Dan Sullivan.

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 amendment No. 1959, offered by the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage, shall be brought to a close?

There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we offer you commonsense reforms. More than half of the Senators on that side just voted for a massive amount of funding that we need for border security. We offer that as well, but we also make it easier for authorities to remove criminals. We end chain migration. We end the diversity visa. We also have a path to citizenship for 1.8 million DACA recipients and Dreamers.

In a sense, this is it. It is the only plan that can become law because the President has said he would sign it. This is it. This is one's last chance to vote for a path to citizenship for all of the people we have been talking about giving justice to and being compassionate about and bringing out of the dark. So here we are with an opportunity to do it. I hope you will vote yes and support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we have waited a long time and worked very hard for the chance to vote on a bill to protect Dreamers. I regret that the only bipartisan effort of the group of moderate Senators to come up with a bipartisan compromise couldn't get the necessary 60 votes, and I expect the Grassley proposal will not get 60 either. I salute the eight brave Republicans who voted for the bipartisan compromise.

There is only one reason the Senate will be unable to reach a bipartisan solution to DACA—President Trump. President Trump created this problem by terminating the DACA Program last August. Since that decision, President Trump has stood in the way of every single proposal that could have become law.

In conclusion, immigration is always a contentious issue. There are intense feelings on both sides of the aisle. If there were ever a time for Presidential leadership, this was it. President Trump has failed his test of leadership—spectacularly.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 39, nays 60, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 36 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rubio
Cochran	Heller	Scott
Corker	Hoeven	Shelby
Cornyn	Isakson	Sullivan
Cotton	Johnson	Tillis
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	Young

NAYS—60

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Barrasso	Harris	Nelson
Bennet	Hassan	Paul
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Jones	Sasse
Cardin	Kaine	Schatz
Carper	Kennedy	Schumer
Casey	King	Shaheen
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tester
Cruz	Markey	Thune
Daines	McCaskill	Udall
Duckworth	Menendez	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Enzi	Moran	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Flake	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 39, the nays are 60.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The Senator from North Carolina.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to 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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IMMIGRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I think it is safe to say it has been a disappointing week. I kept my commitment and set aside the entire week for a broad and productive debate over DACA, border security, and other important immigration issues. My friend the Democratic leader, the assistant Democratic leader, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus—everyone agrees that I held up my end of the bargain.

Back in December, I stated that if a bill that stood a chance of becoming law were ready in January, I would bring it to the floor. No such proposal was produced.

Then, in January, when Democrats shut down the government over this issue, I offered to dedicate this week—this week that we have been in—to an immigration debate and a fair amendment process. I just did that, but the same Democrats failed to produce a solution and, instead, spent the better part of the week objecting to any votes in the Senate.

I thought we might be able to resolve this. I was hoping we could reach a bipartisan solution that could pass the Senate, pass the House, and earn President Trump's signature. But, once again, when the hour came to actually make law instead of just making political points, our friends across the aisle were either unable or unwilling to get something done. After all the talk—all the talk—they hardly came to the table at all.

I supported the plan introduced by Chairman GRASSLEY and several other cosponsors. It fleshed out the President's framework, pairing a more than generous solution for 1.8 million illegal immigrants with commonsense steps to reform legal immigration, secure the border, and help law enforcement keep Americans safe.

In my view, the President came a very long way—clearly, more than halfway—to meet the Democrats on this issue. In exchange for a pathway to citizenship—not just legal status, but a pathway to citizenship—for nearly 2 million individuals, he sensibly wanted to reform pieces of our broken immigration system, secure our border, and make it harder for violent criminals and repeat offenders to prey on American citizens. That is more than a fair bargain—more than a fair bargain.

I thought our friends across the aisle would jump at this opportunity to fulfill what they say is their top priority, but they just couldn't take yes for an answer. They turned away from a golden opportunity to solve the issue. They decided they would rather come away emptyhanded, with no resolution whatsoever for the 1.8 million individuals they say they are championing, than accept a reasonable compromise with the President of the United States.

Even though this week has been squandered, this does not have to be the end of our efforts to resolve these matters. I would encourage Members to put away the talking points and get serious about finding a solution that can actually become law.

I remain eager to improve our immigration policy. If a solution is developed in the future that can pass both the House and the Senate and be signed into law by the President, it should be considered. But for that to happen, Democrats will need to take a second look at these core elements of necessary reform.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 623, Elizabeth Branch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Tim Scott, Todd Young, Richard C. Shelby, John Boozman, Roger F. Wicker, Marco Rubio, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, Jerry Moran, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, David Perdue, John Cornyn, John Thune.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 153, Russell Vought.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Crapo, Orrin G. Hatch, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, Michael B. Enzi, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, James M. Inhofe, John Thune, Lindsey Graham.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 437, Marvin Quattlebaum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, John Kennedy, Richard Burr, Mike Lee, David Perdue, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Jeff Flake, Lindsey Graham, Patrick J. Toomey, Marco Rubio, Tom Cotton, James E. Risch.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 438, Karen Scholer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Karen Gren Scholer, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Karen Gren Scholer, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, John Kennedy, Richard Burr, Mike Lee, David Perdue, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Jeff Flake, Lindsey Graham, Patrick J. Toomey, Marco Rubio, Tom Cotton.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 439, Tilman Eugene Self.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tilman Eugene Self III, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Tilman Eugene Self III, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, David Perdue, John Kennedy, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, Bill Cassidy, John Barrasso.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 536, Terry Doughty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Terry A. Doughty, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Terry A. Doughty, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, David Perdue, John Kennedy, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, Bill Cassidy, John Barrasso.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 617 and 667.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Joel Danies, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe; and Peter Hendrick Vrooman, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Rwanda.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Danies and Vrooman nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 590, 591, 643, 644, 682, and 683.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Norman Euell Arflack, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of four years; Ted G. Kamatchus, of Iowa, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Iowa for the term of four years; Michael T. Baylous, of West Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of West Virginia for the term of four years; Daniel R. McKittrick, of Mississippi, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of four years; David G. Jolley, of Tennessee, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Tennessee for the term of four years; and Thomas M. Griffin, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States Marshal for the District of South Carolina for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Arflack, Kamatchus, Baylous, McKittrick, Jolley, and Griffin nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 472.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Neil Jacobs, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Jacobs nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 661.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Holly W. Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Environmental Protection Agency.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Greaves nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 465.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John C. Demers, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Demers nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 359.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John Marshall Mitnick, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Mitnick nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 645, 646, 647, 648, 662, 684, 685, and 687.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of John Henderson, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; Michael D. Griffin, of Alabama, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering; William Roper, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; Phyllis L. Bayer, of Mississippi, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy; John H. Gibson II, of Texas, to be Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense; Lisa Gordon-Hagerty, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, Department of Energy; Kevin Fahey, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense; and Thomas E. Ayres, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid

upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Henderson, Griffin, Roper, Bayer, Gibson, Gordon-Hagerty, Fahey, and Ayres nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 663.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Melissa F. Burnison, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs).

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Burnison nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for 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.

The Senator from Tennessee.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware is somewhere in the neighborhood, and he has a train to catch in a few minutes. So I ask unanimous consent that after I make a few remarks about today's events and the voting today, the Senator from Delaware be recognized, and that following his speaking, I be recognized again.

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

IMMIGRATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today the Senate voted on immigration.

Immigration is a passionate issue. It affects the lives of people. It affects the American creed, which involves the rule of law, which involves the fact that we are a nation of immigrants. It goes to the heart of our country, and we have very strong opinions about it. All of us know that.

Of course, that is the reason we have a U.S. Senate. This is not an issue that the Shreveport City Council or the Nashville Metro Council can solve. We can't solve the problem of our Nation's borders. We can't solve the problem in our communities about what to do about people who were brought here as children illegally through no fault of their own. That is our job. That is the job of the President of the United States. That is the job of the Senate, and it is the job of the Congress.

We tried before. We tried in 2007, and we failed. We tried in 2013, and this body passed a bill with 68 or 69 votes. I voted for it. If we had passed that bill, as for all the issues we debated today, we wouldn't have them anymore because we dealt then with border security in 2013. We would have added 20,000 border agents, 700 miles of fencing, biometric detection at our ports of exit and entry, and E-Verify for all of the employers in the country. We would have dealt with the issue of legal status for people illegally here, people overstaying their visas, temporary workers. We would have done all of that in 2013, but we did not do it.

So we are left with this problem of a large number of people living in this country—some for a long period of time—who were brought here as children through no fault of their own, which is one problem. We have another problem on the border, which is that the border isn't secure. People coming across the border is one problem, but in my view, the drugs coming across the border are the biggest problem. We have had a lot of hearings in the HELP Committee about opioid addiction. A lot of the heroin and a lot of the illegal drugs that are devastating our communities are coming across our southern border. It is just a fact, and we need to deal with it.

So we are dealing with and we voted today on what to do about the children brought here illegally by their parents through no fault of their own and what to do about border security. The President of the United States did his job on this one.

He did what a President is supposed to do.

I read a book by George Reedy, who was Lyndon Johnson's Press Secretary. He said that a President's job—the Senator from Delaware is a former Governor, so he knows about this. He and I had an executive job when we were Governors. I did my job this way as Governor. A President's job is to see an urgent need, to develop a strategy to meet the need, and to persuade at least half the people you are right. That is what George Reedy said the President's job was, and I think President Trump in this case has done his job. He saw an urgent need. He saw a need of the Dreamers, the DACA people who are here. He saw an urgent need to deal with the border. He saw an urgent need to deal with some other holes in our system of legal immigration. He saw a need to deal with the fact that we have kind of slipped into a situation where the million people a year who come here legally, unlike most countries in the world, are brought here by cousins just because they are cousins. They are not brought here because they are part of the immediate family or because they add something special to our country, either skilled or unskilled, and he sought to change that.

The President recognized the fact that once we give someone legal status in this country, once we say to them: We have decided we want you to be here permanently or nearly permanently. We want you at least one day to dream of becoming a citizen of the United States—I agree with the President on that. I don't want millions of people living in this country permanently who are pledging their allegiance to Afghanistan and Russia and China and Japan and every other country in the world; I want them to stand up in the Federal court or wherever they have the naturalization ceremony—or to be able to dream of standing there—and take the same oath of allegiance to this country that George Washington's soldiers took at Valley Forge, which is the same allegiance today that it was then, where you renounce your allegiance to any other country and you pledge your allegiance to the United States. I want anyone who we have decided deserves legal status on a permanent basis to have that in the back of their mind, not the pledge of allegiance to Korea or Afghanistan or Bangladesh or Chile or any other country in the world.

I think the President did his job. He made a reasonable proposal. I think he did something that most Democrats and many Americans—maybe many Republicans—did not expect him to do. He said: Let's take care permanently of these 1.8 million children who were brought here through no fault of their own. As long as they don't get in trouble and follow the law, are law-abiding, let's give them the dream of citizenship after 10 or 12 years. Let's deal with merit-based immigration. Let's make some changes in our legal system. Let's plug some of the holes in the border so these drugs don't come in.

The President made a very strong proposal. Now we are doing what we are supposed to do. We are supposed to

react to that. Well, we did today. Senator GRASSLEY offered the President's proposal, and it got 39 votes. A bipartisan group offered a narrower version of what the President wanted, and it only included the border security part—$25 billion—and a permanent fix for the DACA or Dreamers, who are here because of that provision in the law. It got 54 votes. But neither got 60. Neither got to 60, which we need.

Why do we need 60 votes? Because we are the U.S. Senate. The House of Representatives only needs a majority. We get 60 because we want a consensus. Why do we need a consensus? When we take on a big, difficult, passionate issue like this, we want the people of this country to accept it. We want them to turn around and look—well, if that many Democrats and that many Republicans thought it was a good idea, then maybe I should rethink my own view and think it is a good idea.

That is why President Trump has a chance to be Nixon to China on the immigration issue. He won his election to a large extent because he promised a wall and he talked about immigration. Now he is saying: Here is a solution that has to do with border security, citizenship, and the DACA children, and people will pay attention to that. And they will pay attention to us if we get more than a bare majority to vote for some version of what the President has recommended. Well, we are up to 54.

I can give you an example of what I just said. In the late 1960s, the debate was civil rights. Everett Dirksen was the minority leader of the Senate; he was the Republican leader. Lyndon Johnson was the President; he was a Democratic President. They worked together to get 68 votes for the civil rights bill of 1968. It was opposed by Senator Richard Russell of Georgia, but when Senator Russell lost, he flew back to Atlanta and said: It is the law, and we should follow it.

That is what we did with civil rights. That is what we did with Social Security. That is what we did with Medicare. That is what we did more recently with fixing No Child Left Behind. That is what we did with 21st Century Cures. When we take on a tough, complicated issue and we talk about it long enough and we get enough of us on both sides of the aisle to agree on it, we get a consensus, the country accepts it, and you don't have to worry about the next Congress coming in and passing it, repealing it, and changing it.

When we don't do that, it is like ObamaCare. It passes with a partisan vote, and then we have a permanent political battle trying to repeal it or replace it. That has been going on for 8 years. We are still not through it yet. We hope to be, but we are not through it yet.

So we need 60 votes for a solution for the DACA children who were brought here and the border security position. Actually, I would suggest our goal should be 70, not 60. We are not going to get there with a situation that has 47 or 48 Democrats and 8 or 9 Republicans—that doesn't make 60 in the public schools of Tennessee—and we won't get it with almost all the Republicans and just a few Democrats. That is not a majority. That is not a consensus. That is not going to persuade the people of this country that we have come up with something lasting that most people can accept. I have no doubt we can get there.

There were 36 Senators of both parties who came to a meeting 3 weeks ago at which we said to our two whips—Senators DURBIN and CORNYN, on each side—we would like for the two of you to help us find a consensus on this. There were 36 of us. There have been 20 or 25 meetings—about equal number in both parties—trying to find some solution here. I think we are making some pretty good progress. We just didn't get there today.

I am glad the majority leader said that this is not the end of it. It can't be the end of it. We can't just leave this here. I can't go back to Tennessee and tell Memphis or Nashville or Knoxville: Sorry, we can't do it, so the mayor or the city council will now decide what to do about these children who are illegally here and about the drugs coming across the southern border and about legal immigration. I can't do that.

I need to say: I am going to go back. The President has done his job. The Senate worked on it for a week. We got up to 54 votes. We need 70. We need 70.

So my hope is that the President will continue to advocate; do his job; see an urgent need—he did; recommend a strategy to deal with the need—he did; and try to persuade at least half the people he is right. He is a good persuader. And then we will do our job, and that is not to stand in the corners and throw things at each other. Let's see where we can agree and do what we did on civil rights and fixing No Child Left Behind. This is not any harder than those issues. We ought to be able to do it; otherwise, we shouldn't be here.

I tell my colleagues often that it is pretty hard to be a Senator. It is hard to get here. It is hard to stay here. And while you are here, you might as well amount to something, and amounting to something means getting a result. We didn't get a result today, but I am convinced that we can.

In conclusion—and then I will go to my friend from Delaware—how do we get to 70? Well, I came up here years ago and worked for a Senator named Howard Baker. He was very successful in this body. He ended up as the majority leader. He stood right over there next to Senator Byrd when he was the Democratic leader. They had great differences of opinion, but they ran this body very well. Howard Baker had a saying. He said that it helped to be an eloquent listener, and he said that you have to remember that sometimes the other fellow might be right.

I would like to say to my Democratic friends that in this case the other fellow might be named Trump. They might not like that. They may not like it, but I think we should give the President credit for seeing an urgent need, recommending a strategy, and doing his best to persuade half of the Americans that he is right about that.

I think we need some Members on the other side to do what eight of us on the Republican side did this day, which is move the other direction, recognize that the other fellow might be right, come to a conclusion, and do our job. I think we made a start this week, but we are not there yet. I look forward to the opportunity to finish the job, and remembering Howard Baker's advice that the other fellow might be right might be a good way to start.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague from Tennessee for yielding to me.

One of the reasons Howard Baker was one of the great leaders in this place is he had good staff, and one of those folks, who was maybe the senior member of his staff lo those many years ago, was LAMAR ALEXANDER, now Senator ALEXANDER. Howard Baker would be very proud of the kind of Senator he has become—a great Governor, Secretary of Education. He is someone who speaks, more often than not, with great wisdom. He and I agree on not everything but pretty much everything.

I am mister glass half full. My wife says to me that I need to be more of a realist. She says I am too much of an optimist. I am not an optimist today. I feel like we leave here—get on a train, go home—feeling like we have not done our job.

The Senator from Tennessee has said that the President did his job, but I just don't agree. I just don't agree. He served as Governor; I served as Governor. if we had an impasse on a difficult issue in Delaware—we are lucky; we are a small state—we can pull people together to resolve just about anything and figure out what we call the four c's. One of those is close to Delaware. No. 1 is communicate. No. 2 is compromise. No. 3 is collaborate. No. 4 is civility. Those are the four c's. That is the reason why we had some success in our State.

I am not sure we really demonstrated enough of those today. I am not sure the President did as much as he could have done and should have done. We have a Bible study that meets here on Thursdays, as the Senator from Tennessee knows. Seven or eight of us that need the most help meet with the Chaplain of the Senate, Barry Black, retired rear admiral and chief of chaplains for the Navy and Marine Corps.

Today in our Bible study, he mentioned the golden rules: Treat people the way we want to be treated. Love

thy neighbor as thyself. And ask the question: Who is our neighbor? He told the parable about the Good Samaritan. Oftentimes, he mentioned Matthew 25, which deals with the least of these. When I was hungry, did you feed me? When I was naked, did you clothe me? When I was thirsty, did you give me a drink? When I was sick and in prison, did you visit me? When I was a stranger in your land, did you welcome me?

I think there is a moral imperative here. In the case where young people were brought here when they were very young from another country by their parents, have grown up here, were educated here, and are working here in all kinds of jobs—jobs that need to be filled—to say by our actions today that sometime in March—maybe March 5—a lot of them will be facing the prospect of being rounded up and sent back to where they were born, I think, there is a moral imperative that says that is not right.

In Delaware State University, we have any number of Dreamers who are students there. They are the most impressive young people I have met in my life. They are smart. They work hard. They are good students. They are going to go off and be great employees. They are going to start businesses of their own. For us to say that there is a good chance that you will be sent back to where you were born, doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me. I think it is morally wrong.

I think it is also economically wrong. Today, a bunch of folks in the landscaping business came to see me. They wanted to talk about the problems they have getting people to come to work for their firms, to work for their companies, and to do landscaping work. It is not easy work. It is hard to find people to do it. In many cases, the folks that will do it come day after day—a day's work for a day's pay. They are people who have come here from other countries. The landscapers today—I don't know if they are Democrats or Republicans—are frustrated because they have a good business and customers need their work to be done, and they have a hard time getting Americans born and raised here to do the work.

Earlier this week, on Monday, I was in Georgetown, DE. We raise more chickens in Sussex County, DE, than anywhere in America. There are 400 chickens for every person who lives in my State. Poultry is a big business. We met with folks from the Delmarva Peninsula who are very much involved in the poultry industry. They said basically the same thing we heard today from the landscapers: We have a hard time finding people who will work in poultry plants. We have done a lot of things we can to enhance the pay and the benefits. We have wellness centers. We provide incentives for people who want to improve themselves, go on, and have a chance to move up the ladder of success.

But there was one lady who said that she is from a major poultry company. I think it was Perdue. She said: We are trying to fill positions. We have 100 people who offer to come in for an interview. She said that out of the 100, they actually have 20 that reach the second step because they can pass the blood test and meet other challenges they have, or obstacles, in order to reach the next rung on the ladder for an interview. They start with 100 and are down to 20 almost like that. Out of those 20, she said, eventually 5 will be able to pass the drug test and have the work experience and the willingness to work. She said they end up with five to hire. Out of those five they hire, a number of them stop coming to work a month later. She said that is what they face; that is reality. And then she said: Please help us. In fact, all the poultry industry people we met on Monday said: Please help us with this.

As it turns out, it is not just landscaping businesses that need people to work. It is not just food processors—poultry in this case. When we received the monthly jobs report earlier this month for the month of January, we were told that the unemployment rate is about 4.1 percent—steady where it was. We are still under way with the longest running economic expansion. I think we are past 8 years now. When people went to work today, there were about 2 to 3 million jobs that were not filled. When folks went to work in this country today across America, for about 2 to 3 million jobs, nobody showed up to do the job. It makes no sense to me that we face the prospect of 700,000, 800,000 people who were raised here, were educated here, work here, want to work here, and want to contribute, could do those jobs, and they may not get a chance to do them.

Employers have risen up with one voice, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Roundtable, the National Federation of Independent Businesses, and the Farm Bureau—you name it—to say: We have a problem on the human resources side with getting people to come to work.

I think it is economic insanity for us to say that for 700,000 or 800,000 people and maybe a couple hundred thousand people that came here from El Salvador: We are going to send you home.

It makes no sense.

I hope my friend is right. I hope we leave here, come back in a week or so, and say: How do we get to an agreement?

The last thing I will say is this. Border security is really important. I was chairman of the Homeland Security Committee for a while. I am still the senior Democrat on the committee. If you compare border security in this country today to what it was 10, 20 years ago, it is a more secure border. It should be. We spent a fortune. We have 20,000 people down in border security. We are doing a lot of smarter things.

I will conclude with this point. Included in the proposal today that, I think, got the most votes—54 votes—was the Collins, King, et al. Included in that package were a number of what I call force multipliers. They would actually make the border more secure. There is someplace along the border where a wall makes sense, like in San Diego. I was stationed in the Navy in San Diego. There are some places there, and there are other places where a wall makes sense. I heard more than a few times: If you build a 15-foot wall, someone will come along with an 18-foot ladder, or come along with a tunnel to go under it.

There are a lot of things we can do to assist the 20,000 Border Patrol men and women we have. We are having a hard time filling those 20,000 positions. We have hundreds of those jobs vacant today.

Do you know where we could put people to work on the border? At ports of entry, where hundreds of millions of dollars of commerce are coming through every week—coming up from Mexico and going down into Mexico. There is a crying need for 3,000 people to work as Customs officers at the ports of entry.

My colleague talks, as he should, about concern about drugs coming into our country. Right now, the biggest threat is from China. They are coming over here ordered by the internet. There is stuff coming in by the mail service. Senator PORTMAN and I are working to do a much tighter job in that regard to stop the importation of fentanyl through the Postal Service.

There are a bunch of things that we can do on the border that were included in the bipartisan proposal today. I will mention a couple of them. It is not just enough to have drones. You have to have drones that you can fly. You have to have good surveillance systems. You have to have people who maintain them. And they don't just fly 8 hours out of every 24. They are able to be up in the sky throughout the day and throughout the week with the kind of surveillance systems that are needed.

It is not just enough to have a couple of helicopters that can fly every day, but they have to be able to go 24/7 and have the same kind of surveillance systems that are good. With fixed-wing aircraft, the same is true. I was a naval flight officer of a P–3 air mission command. We did a lot of surface surveillance and chased submarines all over the world. They would send us out in the ocean to look for somebody's ship that had sunken or a sailboat that had sunken. Sometimes all we would have in the middle of the ocean was a pair of binoculars—good luck finding anybody.

We don't have to just use binoculars on the border, with drones, fixed-wing aircraft, helicopters, fixed-wing towers, or mobile towers. We have surveillance systems that can enable us to see 15, 20, 25 miles into Mexico. We should use them and make sure they are maintained and that people are trained to operate them.

When you have hundreds of miles of river, building a wall there doesn't

make sense. Boats do and boat ramps make sense. In places where the wall may not make sense, a fence may make sense. Roads along the fence may make sense. In some places, Border Patrol on horses makes sense. In some places, we have high grasses. Put a Border Patrol officer up on a horse and he can see for miles and miles. That makes sense.

This and more was included in the proposal that drew 54 votes. It is the kind of thing we ought to do. It doesn't cost $25 billion, but it will be cost-effective and make our border more secure.

I have great affection for our colleague from Tennessee. I appreciate his encouraging tone that this is not the end. What did Churchill say when he got bounced out of office at end of World War II? He was asked 6 months after the war, when he really carried Britain through on his back. The war is over. He gets beaten. He is asked by a reporter after he lost: For you, Mr. Churchill, is this the end?

He said: It is not the end. It is not the beginning of the end. It is the end of the beginning.

I hope this is the end of the beginning—maybe with the help of God and maybe with a little bit better leadership from the folks down at 1600.

The last thing is this. The Department of Homeland Security—which I worked for years to strengthen, to make something we can all be proud of—apparently has put out a statement today. I asked to read it. I am told by all kinds of people that it is riddled with inaccuracies and falsehoods. I am going to read it tonight on the way going home. I hope that is not true. What we need to operate here is the truth.

I will close with the words of Thomas Jefferson: If the people know the truth, we will not make a mistake. I heard that what the Department of Homeland Security put out today was not truthful. It is hard, with that kind of information, to do the right thing.

I wish to thank my colleague for giving me this much time and for being so patient with me. We will be back here in 10 days or so, and we will have a chance to reconnect and see if we can pull a victory out of the jaws of defeat.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware for his remarks and his comments. I certainly hope that when we come back, we can get a result. That is what the job is about. I cosponsored and voted for the President's legislation. I cosponsored and voted for the bipartisan legislation. My hope is that I have a chance to cosponsor and vote for legislation that gets 65 or 70 votes and solves the problem.

THANKING THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM ALABAMA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to note the presence on the floor of the junior Senator from Alabama, Mr. JONES, who has been waiting patiently. He and I were working together on something that I am about to speak about, a resolution that has to do with an event that happened 50 years ago, the Memphis sanitation workers strike.

He has plenty to say about it, but he has not yet made what we call his maiden speech on the Senate floor. We usually reserve that moment for a singular opportunity to speak. So he is waiting until that time to speak. I respect that. I told him the little story of what happened to Senator Baker when he was in Senator JONES' position. Baker's father-in-law, Senator Dirksen, whom I mentioned, was the leader. Everybody assembled to hear Baker's maiden speech. Baker spoke a little too long. Dirksen came over to congratulate him. Baker looked up and said to his father-in-law, Senator Dirksen: How did I do?

Dirksen said: Howard, perhaps you should occasionally enjoy the luxury of an unexpressed thought.

So I congratulate Senator JONES on his sticking with tradition here. I value the fact that we are working together on civil rights, as well as the fact that we will be in Memphis together on the Civil Rights Pilgrimage, which he is taking a part in leading early next month. I thank him for being on the floor today while I make these remarks.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MEMPHIS SANITATION WORKERS STRIKE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, 1968 was a tumultuous year. Violent protests erupted in cities across the country. Both Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and then-Senator and Presidential candidate Robert F. Kennedy were assassinated, and American soldiers were fighting in the Vietnam war.

In Memphis, TN, African-American sanitation workers had faced years of hazardous working conditions and discrimination in pay and benefits. Their strike would become a historic event in the civil rights movement.

In January 1968, the workers began negotiating with Memphis Mayor Henry Loeb and the Memphis City Council to improve pay and working conditions.

On February 1, 1968, two sanitation workers, Echol Cole and Robert Walker, sought shelter from the pouring rain and were crushed to death in their garbage truck when the compactor on the truck malfunctioned. Their deaths galvanized the 1,300 African-American sanitation workers who decided to begin their strike to protest working conditions on February 12, 1968.

The workers demanded recognition of their union, increased pay, and safer working conditions. Mayor Loeb and the city council responded by threatening to replace the striking workers unless they returned to work.

Throughout February and early March, negotiations continued, and on March 28, 1968, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Rev. James Lawson led a march from the Clayborn Temple that ended with rioting, arrests, and the death of 16-year-old Larry Payne. Civil rights leaders vowed to march again, focusing on the principles of nonviolence.

On April 3, 1968, Dr. King addressed a rally of 10,000 African-American workers and residents, members of the clergy, and union members at the Mason Temple—the Memphis headquarters of the Church of God in Christ. His speech included these lines:

> I have been to the mountain top. . . . I've seen the Promised Land. I may not get there with you. But I want you to know tonight that we, as a people, will get to the Promised Land.

That was Dr. Martin Luther King.

The next day, April 4, 1968, Dr. King was assassinated as he stood on a balcony at the Lorraine Motel.

On April 8, 1968, 4 days later, 42,000 people marched in Memphis. The strike was resolved on April 16. The 1,300 sanitation workers in Memphis took a stand for freedom, and they displayed courage in their pursuit of equality.

In his speech on April 3, Dr. King said:

> Now we're going to march again, and we've got to march again, in order to put the issue where it is supposed to be—and force everybody to see that there are 1,300 of God's children here suffering, sometimes going hungry, going through dark and dreary nights wondering how this thing is going to come out. That's the issue. And we've got to say to the nation: We know how it's coming out. For when people get caught up with that which is right and they are willing to sacrifice for it, there is no stopping point short of victory.

Now, 50 years later, this resolution that I, Senator JONES, Senator CARDIN, and Senator CORKER submitted seeks to recognize their sacrifice and contributions to the civil rights movement.

It is important that our children grow up learning about how these 1,300 Memphis sanitation workers and many others struggled for racial justice in the midst of all that chaos. That is why, on Tuesday, I submitted the Senate resolution to which I referred. I did it, along with U.S. Senator BOB CORKER, my colleague from Tennessee; Senator DOUG JONES from Alabama; and Senator BEN CARDIN from Maryland, to recognize the 50th anniversary of the 1968 Memphis sanitation workers strike.

Representative STEVE COHEN has submitted the same resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives. He recruited 76 cosponsors.

I would like to thank Representative COHEN for taking the lead in the House. I would like to thank my Tennessee colleagues, Representatives BLACK, BLACKBURN, COOPER, DESJARLAIS, DUNCAN, FLEISCHMANN, KUSTOFF, and ROE for their support as well.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution.

The majority leader has asked me to make some concluding remarks.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive section for the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 588, 589, 642, 677, 678, 679, 680, and 681.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Joseph D. Brown, of Texas, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas for the term of four years; Matthew D. Krueger, of Wisconsin, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of four years; John H. Durham, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years; John C. Anderson, of New Mexico, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Mexico for the term of four years; Brandon J. Fremin, of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years; Joseph P. Kelly, of Nebraska, to be United States Attorney for the District of Nebraska for the term of four years; Scott W. Murray, of New Hampshire, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Hampshire for the term of four years; and David C. Weiss, of Delaware, to be United States Attorney for the District of Delaware for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Brown, Krueger, Durham, Anderson, Fremin, Kelly, Murray, and Weiss nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for 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.

FORCED SEPARATION AT THE BORDER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the actions by the Trump administration regarding undocumented immigrants in this country have been ineffective and nothing short of heartless. Their priorities have abandoned long-held practices such as the need to focus limited enforcement resources on those who actually present a public safety risk.

These changes are being felt by families across the country. Last fall, Rosa Maria Hernandez, a 10-year-old girl with cerebral palsy who was taken to the hospital for urgent surgery was forcibly taken into custody by ICE when she was discharged, instead of being released into the care of her parents as recommended by her doctors. A few months ago, Jose Fuentes who was fleeing El Salvador with his 1-year-old son, Mateo, was detained at the border and transferred to a facility in San Diego while Mateo was held in Texas. These actions are appalling and run counter to the time honored values in this country. No child should be separated from their parents in this way. The effect of such a traumatic experience and disrupted attachments on children, adolescents and families is longlasting. The cost of these failed policies will not be fully realized for years to come.

Under current policy, families are supposed to be kept intact while awaiting a decision on whether they will be deported and held in special family detention centers or released with a court date. The Trump administration's proposed policy change sends parents to adult detention facilities, while their children would be placed in shelters designed for juveniles or with a relative in the United States.

Wendy Smith recently wrote an article in the Chronicle of Social Change on the Trump administration's proposed policy of separating immigrant children from parents entering the United States illegally, as a means of deterring immigrant families from coming to the United States. I ask unanimous consent that this January 29, 2018, article entitled ''Separating Families at the Border Will Multiply Child Trauma'' be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chronicle of Social Change, Jan. 29, 2018]

SEPARATING FAMILIES AT THE BORDER WILL MULTIPLY CHILD TRAUMA

(By Wendy Smith)

Parents do not uproot their children to make a long and dangerous journey to an uncertain future in the U.S. unless the circumstances in their home country are so threatening that the risks of migration pale in comparison to more certain risks at home. They leave their homes, other family members, schools, churches and familiar communities because they feel they must.

In December 2017, the Trump Administration proposed a new policy of separating immigrant children from parents entering the U.S. illegally, as a means of discouraging or deterring immigrant families from Central America and other countries from coming to the U.S.

Although the administration has already engaged in this practice in some cases, this policy would alter the current standard, which has attempted to keep families intact while asylum issues are considered and addressed.

As a former psychotherapist, I saw firsthand the long-lasting effects of traumatic experience and disrupted attachments on children, adolescents and families. Having taught courses in child development, I know that development of the brain and the child are inextricably linked to environmental opportunities and dangers, and to the continuing presence of important relationships to mediate the environment.

Recovery from trauma and attachment loss is possible, but requires enormous time, effort and care. This knowledge tells me that a policy of separating families should sound an alarm for us all.

Advocates, immigration experts, academics and lawyers have voiced concerns regarding the issues of constitutionality, deterrence, negative effects and unanticipated consequences, alongside the undermining of the core American value of family unity.

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child—ratified by every country on the planet except Somalia, Sudan and the United States—specifies that children, including immigrant and refugee children, should be treated with dignity and respect and should not be exposed to conditions that may harm or traumatize them.

Family unity and reunification is one of the primary stated goals of the U.S. immigration system, found in many sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) of 1952. It is also a central theme of American identity. In Moore v. City of East Cleveland, the Supreme Court held that ''the Constitution protects the sanctity of the family precisely because the institution of the family is deeply rooted in this nation's history and tradition.''

The constitution does not allow the government to detain one asylum-seeking family for the sole purpose of deterring that action on the part of other families. And finally, through both United Nations conventions and protocols and U.S. law, migrants have rights not to be returned where their life or freedom would be threatened on the basis of race, religion, nationality, social group or opinion. If these factors exist, migrants can seek asylum if they can show ''well-founded'' fear of persecution.

The impact of such policies on children is severe. Stress is defined as the result of events or circumstances in which physical or psychological demands exceed our ability to cope. A critical buffer to the detrimental effects of stress is a protective relationship, such as with a parent who can provide comfort and a sense of safety.

Prolonged exposure to stress in the absence of a protective relationship causes the human stress response system to remain activated, preventing rest and recovery of the coping system, and the child's ability to manage or regain the sense of safety necessary to move forward in life is severely compromised.

Trauma, the most extreme form of toxic stress, is the occurrence of events or situations in which one's physical or psychological integrity is threatened (such as a

natural disaster, an assault, or the violent or sudden loss of a loved one).

Leaving home, making a difficult journey, and arriving in a new country are circumstances that profoundly affect children. Separation from parents on the heels of these overwhelming experiences can be terrifying, and may have long-lasting effects.

Trauma exposure and disrupted attachment can have similar negative outcomes; when the two are combined, the negative effects on children's development and functioning may be compounded.

Adversity early in life is associated with deficits in such important functions as cognitive performance, executive functions, and the processing of social and emotional stimuli, among others. The nature and severity of deficits is related to the nature of the trauma, the presence or absence of protective relationships, and the age and vulnerability of the child.

A 2010 study that examined effects of immigration raids on children ages 0–17—during the first six months after the enforcement activities, and again after nine months—noted problems with basic functions such as eating and sleeping, constant crying, and widespread changes to behavior, school performance, and developmental reversal, or loss of developmental milestones that had been achieved prior to the separation from parents. In other words, the sudden and unexpected loss of parents not only impeded forward development, but sent children backwards on the developmental trajectory.

Traumatized and suffering children, disrupted or delayed development, long-term educational and behavioral problems—these are neither reasonable nor morally acceptable trade-offs for the unproven possibility that future families will be persuaded not to enter our country illegally.

The policy of separating families at the border must be abandoned in favor of alternatives that are humane, constitutional and supportive of family unity.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA TENNIEN MURPHY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the University of Vermont's College of Nursing has so much of which to be proud. My wife, Marcelle, who serves on the college's advisory board, recently showed me a touching article about Barbara Tennien Murphy. It speaks so much to the value of nurses and the education they received in Vermont, just as Marcelle did. I ask unanimous consent that this article, which was published on the university's website last year, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UVM NURSING THROUGH THE DECADES: 1940S

Taking the Lead: Barbara Tennien Murphy '47

In June 1947, the first students to achieve a bachelor's degree in nursing from the University of Vermont crossed the lawn in front of the Waterman Building to accept their diplomas. Of the 267 students graduating UVM that day, only two were in the new five-year nursing program: Ruby Sanderson of Winsted, Connecticut and Barbara Tennien, of Pittsford, Vermont. At 92 years old, in the year of her 70th college reunion, Barbara Tennien Murphy '47 reflected on her time at UVM with fondness and gratitude for being part of something important.

Few women attended college in the 1940s and most nurses lacked academic degrees. ''You didn't even need a high school diploma to become a nurse. A bachelor's degree for nursing was very new,'' Murphy said. ''Getting a degree wasn't a big deal to me, but there weren't a lot of choices (for women). I liked math and was pretty good at it.''

Murphy comes from a family full of UVM graduates and working professionals: Her father, Jerome Tennien '15, majored in agriculture and served on the UVM student council. He managed a U.S. government farm in Panama before settling on his family farm in Pittsford, Vermont, where he taught agriculture at the local high school. Uncles Jim Tennian '10 and Bill Tennian '17 studied engineering. Murphy's brother, Jim '43, a mechanical engineer at Wright Field in Ohio, died in a test flight crash shortly after graduating. Her mother, Mary, was a nurse, and sister, Mary, attended the College of St. Rose and taught high school in Windsor, Vermont.

Murphy entered UVM in 1942, before UVM offered a nursing degree. ''I started in home economics. I was not in love with it. The next year the nursing program began. I immediately knew that was what I wanted,'' she recalled. ''I wanted to use my brain to make my hands work, and they very nicely opened the doors to a degree in nursing. I felt very comfortable with it, I felt complete.''

COMPASSION AND FOCUS

Murphy admired her mother, who went on medical calls in Pittsford with the town doctor and occasionally cared for patients in the Tennien home. One patient, a little girl about six years old, affected her deeply.

''Her leg had been cut off by a mowing machine on a farm. They hacked it off and gave her a metal prosthesis to wear on her leg. I was 17, and I felt that I wanted to take care of her,'' Murphy remembered. ''It was a compassion, for her and for others who needed people to care for them. My mother cared for people. She went to the neighbors and took care of things for them. Nobody talked about it, it's just what we did. It was what I wanted.''

While at UVM, Murphy participated in the All Sports Club and lettered in Rifle, an activity taught by an army sergeant at a firing range on campus. ''I liked shooting,'' she explained. ''I also played badminton and bowled. The university had bowling allies with duckpins.''

World War II was underway, and most young American men were off to war, so UVM students were predominantly female. The men's dormitories became sorority housing. Murphy lived in Slade Hall. The workload was intense, she said, so she had little time for sororities.

''That first year, you didn't get credit for nursing classes, and so you had to take a lot of classes. One year I carried 22 credit hours, which was completely insane. But if you wanted to do it, that's what you had to do. We were the first class, they were experimenting on us,'' she quipped. ''I liked the work at school, and I liked the work at the hospital.''

Murphy did her nursing clinicals at Mary Fletcher Hospital, a predecessor to the University of Vermont Medical Center. With the war in progress, most of the male staff and hospital supplies had gone to the front lines.

''It was war time, and all the porters and help were in the army, so we did everything. We did the cooking of the baby's formulas, scraping the meat of gristle for baby food and washing the linens. We made sure the babies, children and old people taken care of. We washed diapers and bed pans.''

She believes that the hard work and long days helped her become a better nurse.

''I finished my 8 hours and then at 7:00 when we went off-duty, we mopped the floors after because we didn't have anyone else to do it. The head nurse was mopping beside you. Everyone worked together to accomplish what needs to be done,'' she recalled. ''Some of the time it was boring, but we learned what you do when you don't have what you need, and how to do it if a lot of stuff is not available. It makes for an excellent adult life. I know my responsibility to my patients.''

SHOWING GRATITUDE

Murphy passed the Vermont Board of Nurse Registration exam to become an R.N. in 1947. She received a gold seal and second highest honors with 94 points, just one point less than Ruby Sanderson. ''I didn't mind. Ruby was a nice person and a hard worker,'' Murphy said.

After graduating, Murphy taught nursing at Barre City Hospital, a forerunner to Central Vermont Medical Center, and then worked at the Boston Children's Hospital. In this period, she experienced an event that shaped her outlook on life and informed her future relationships.

The polio epidemic was in full swing in the late 1940s, and the young nurse Tennien was assigned to manage the hospital's polio ward. Her unit included the infectious disease laboratory where microbiologist John Franklin Enders cultivated poliovirus for vaccine development (for which he received the 1954 Nobel Prize for Medicine). He grew the virus in human cells—fecal matter—and it was Nurse Tennien's job to collect stool specimens, prepare them properly and send them to the lab.

''One day, someone bumped into me in the hall—I thought it was one of the underlings,'' she recalled. ''He said, 'I know who you are Miss T. I couldn't do my job if you didn't do yours so well.' It was John Enders!'' His praise resonated with the young nurse, and she never forgot that feeling.

''He admitted that other people under him doing the scut work are equally important because they keep him going. It wasn't an inspiring thing to do, collecting smelly stools, but he couldn't have grown the polio virus without me. I've always tried to make sure the people under me knew they were appreciated.''

She married William Murphy, an aircraft engineer she met on a blind date arranged by her assistant head nurse. Eventually they settled in Connecticut where Bill worked at Pratt & Whitney, and together they raised five children, a girl followed by four boys.

She attended graduate school at Boston University, studying for a Masters degree in nursing. She completed all of the coursework, but never wrote her thesis. ''I had all the knowledge and I always worked, but I never tried to establish a big career because I had six others I was taking care of.''

Murphy worked in a nursing home at night so she could care for her children during the day. ''People would say to me, 'How do you take care of an eight-room house and five kids and volunteer in the school library and work nights in a nursing home?' Well, you put one foot in front of the other and keep slogging along—it's all good,'' she said.

A FULL HEART

Working with elders in a nursing home amplified Murphy's great appreciation for the power of love in healing. She recalled, ''We had two old ladies in adjoining beds. One was dying, and the woman in the bed next to her said, 'Move that bureau so that I can be next to her.' Margaret held her hand all night and pulled her through it. She didn't die. We gave her the oxygen, and she gave her the love.''

Murphy also taught math at Saint Francis School of Nursing in Hartford, Connecticut, teaching students how to calculate percentages for solutions and medications. ''In those

days, the nurses on the floor mixed up their own IV's, it didn't come out of the pharmacy,'' she explained. ''We didn't have IV teams or drip machines. Now that seems like ancient history.''

She retired from Manchester Memorial Hospital in Manchester, Connecticut, in 1987 at age 62, when her husband became ill and required constant care. She and Bill moved to Putney, Vermont, and when he passed she moved in with her children. She only recently stopped volunteering for her church, visiting the sick and washing alter linens. Murphy stays fit and spry with daily walks on a treadmill, healthy diet, reading books and playing board games with her eight grandchildren. She enjoys keeping up with health science news and reading scholarly articles online. She's honored to represent the first generation of college-educated nurses, and delighted to watch the profession's evolution and progress.

''I follow nursing and the sciences. There are so many things in my life now that people speak of so routinely, that didn't exist before. I've done it all, from prenatal to old people's homes, and I've had a ball,'' she reflected. ''Nursing is what I am. I'm proud to see the young women who work in labs or go into other countries and use their education.''

TRIBUTE TO CECILE RICHARDS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to recognize the inspiring and dedicated work of Cecile Richards, who has recently announced she is stepping down as president of Planned Parenthood after 12 years.

Throughout her tenure as president of Planned Parenthood, Cecile has been a passionate advocate for healthcare for women and men across the country. Despite the constant attacks leveled at Planned Parenthood in recent years, the organization managed to grow stronger with Cecile at the helm. Today Planned Parenthood has more volunteers, supporters, and donors than it ever has had before. None of that would have been possible without Cecile's exemplary leadership.

Millions of Americans depend on Planned Parenthood for their healthcare, and for many, Planned Parenthood is their only source of care. As president, Cecile maintained Planned Parenthood's mission, and she never stopped fighting for the millions of American women and men—including tens of thousands of Vermonters—that have trusted and depended on Planned Parenthood for their basic healthcare needs, including annual health exams, cervical and breast cancer tests, and HIV screenings. Because of her dedication to helping low-income women, she worked to ensure free birth control coverage was included in the Affordable Care Act. Cecile is leaving as president when the teen pregnancy rate is at a historical low and unintended pregnancies overall are at a 30-year low. None of that would have been possible without Cecile's relentless determination to her mission of helping those that do not have the resources to help themselves.

The true measurement of Cecile's work at Planned Parenthood goes beyond the statistics, however, for she understood that the organization's strength comes from the voices of those who believe access to healthcare for all women is a right. Those who up until recently believed that there was nothing they could do or say that would make a difference. Those who simply went on with their lives as if they had no other options. It is those same people who have taken to the streets—in Washington, in Vermont, and across the world—to let their voices be heard. Cecile's unwavering passion and commitment to advocating for these voices is one of her greatest strengths as a leader.

While Planned Parenthood is stronger than ever, Cecile leaves a legacy that will be hard to follow. Her ability to lead with grace and courage has given hope to those who need it most. She has truly been inspiration to us all.

Marcelle and I wish Cecile Richards all the best as she moves into the next chapter.

TRIBUTE TO KEN SQUIER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is my honor and privilege to recognize the achievements of a great Vermont broadcaster and friend, Ken Squier.

Ken recently became the first journalist ever to be enshrined in the NASCAR Hall of Fame. While his roots are at WDEV Radio in Waterbury, VT, Ken is known nationally as the country's most recognizable voice of auto racing. Without question, Ken's voice and calls of the most memorable auto races were key to the rise in prominence of the sport.

Still, with all of the national recognition, Ken has always made Vermont his home. His radio station, WDEV, is strongly committed to community service and serves the people of his hometown and the greater Vermont community with distinction. Ken Squier is, without question, a Vermont treasure.

In honor of Ken's induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame and his continued outstanding service to Vermont, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Jasper Goodman, from the January 24, 2018 edition of the Barre Montpelier Times Argus, ''Profile: Squier a living legend,'' be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Times Argus, Jan. 24, 2018]

PROFILE: SQUIER A LIVING LEGEND

(By Jasper Goodman)

''Guys like Neil Bonnett and Tiny Lund and so many of those guys who were so good—they all died doing what they wanted to do, which is not the same as any other sport. If you are dedicated to racing, it can cost you your life. I just felt they needed to be represented far more than announcers or promoters or sponsors''—Ken Squier.

Seldom is Ken Squier wrong in his prognostications about the motorsports industry. But when he told me five years ago that he would never be officially inducted into the NASCAR Hall of Fame, I had my doubts.

Squier had just returned home from a trip to Charlotte, North Carolina, where he and Barney Hall were presented with the first annual Squier-Hall Award for NASCAR Media Excellence, an honor for which they were conamesakes. He felt at the time that he had reached the pinnacle of his career.

NASCAR had just unveiled an exhibit in its Hall of Fame museum that featured audio from his famous broadcast of the 1979 Daytona 500. Each year since then, a media member has been honored with an award named after him.

Last weekend, Ken Squier returned to the Hall of Fame in Charlotte—this time to accept an even more prestigious honor: being the first journalist ever inducted into the NASCAR Hall of Fame itself.

''Because the panel is made up of a majority of drivers and media guys, there were two or three who said, 'You just have to be there.' So there I went,'' Squier said.

Around Vermont, as the former owner of WDEV Radio and Thunder Road, Squier has been a prominent public figure. But at NASCAR events, fans worship the ground he walks on. Why?

It's simple: NASCAR wouldn't be the sport it is today without him.

As auto racing rose in prominence during the 1960s and early '70s, the sport began appearing on television. But it was never given the treatment that baseball, basketball, football or hockey got: live, start-to-finish coverage.

In 1979, Squier changed that.

At the direction of NASCAR co-founder Bill France Sr., Squier convinced skeptical CBS–TV executives to air flag-to-flag coverage of the Daytona 500.

It was a smashing success—literally. The race ended in thrilling fashion, with Cale Yarborough and Donnie Allison spinning out and getting in a fistfight on the infield. Ken and color commentator David Hobbs vividly captured the excitement and delivered a live broadcast to 15.1 million viewers, many of whom were snowed into their homes after a blizzard buried the Northeast.

That date—Feb. 18, 1979—was when racing went from being a Southern fringe-sport to a nationwide phenomenon.

Squier served as the lap-by-lap commentator for the next 20 Daytona 500s. He famously nicknamed the event ''The Great American Race.''

''The beaches of Daytona, in Ormond—that's the history of American motorsports,'' Squier said. ''They were racing there over 100 years ago. . . . This wasn't just another race—this was Daytona.''

Squier expresses hesitation about being in the same Hall of Fame as the racing legends who he covered.

''There was still that catch in my throat,'' he said. ''Guys like Neil Bonnett and Tiny Lund and so many of those guys who were so good—they all died doing what they wanted to do, which is not the same as any other sport. If you are dedicated to racing, it can cost you your life. I just felt they needed to be represented far more than announcers or promoters or sponsors.''

Squier's hesitation is unsurprising. Unlike many modern-day broadcasters who enjoy directing the spotlight at themselves, Squier has never been one to place himself at the center of attention. Vermont Governor and three-time Thunder Road track champion Phil Scott noted last Friday that in the first draft of Squier's acceptance speech, there was ''not one single mention of himself.''

''He's been telling us the great American story his whole life,'' Scott said in his introduction of Squier at the Hall of Fame induction ceremony. ''But we never hear his story.''

The line about Squier not wanting to talk about himself was repeated over and over again last weekend. And in a 90–minute interview for this story, it proved to be largely true. Squier managed to eloquently brush off questions about his career accomplishments. Instead, he chronicled the history of motorsports—as he so often does in conversation.

But make no mistake: The fact that Squier rarely speaks of himself isn't a character flaw. It's what makes him the best at what he does.

He is a storyteller—not of his own life, but of others'. And without his innate ability to deliver those stories, NASCAR would have never enjoyed the national prominence that it does today.

Squier grew up in Waterbury and worked throughout his adolescence at WDEV, which his father, Lloyd, founded in 1931.

''I was lucky,'' Squier said. ''(WDEV) was always full of kids—young, young guys. And Rusty (Parker) ran it fluidly. It gave me an opportunity that a lot of people wouldn't have had to go out and do something that I really desired, which was the racing. It was big and it was growing and every year it got bigger and bigger. But I could always come home.''

Even as he rose to national prominence, Squier always called Vermont home.

''I loved Verniont and everything it stood for,'' he said.

Squier once described NASCAR drivers as ''ordinary people doing extraordinary things.''

The same can be said of Squier, an ordinary, down-to-earth Vermonter who changed a sport in extraordinary ways.

Squier has given much of his life to NASCAR. Last weekend, the sport gave back to him.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, BBEDCA, establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits, while sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. The Senate recently considered and passed H.R. 1892 with S. Amdt. 1930, the text of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, which provided emergency funding for disaster relief.

This legislation includes language that increases security discretionary budget authority by $1,170 million and nonsecurity discretionary budget authority by $83,266 million this year. This measure contains provisions that designate these appropriations as emergency funding pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of BBEDCA. CBO estimates that this budget authority will increase discretionary outlays by $11,185 million in 2018.

As a result of the aforementioned designations, I am revising the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations by increasing the revised security and nonsecurity budget authority limits and the amount of allowable outlays by the amounts listed above. Further, I am increasing the budgetary aggregates for 2018 by those same amounts.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to Sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

$s in millions	2018
Current Spending Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	3,085,147
Outlays	3,101,424
Adjustments:	
Budget Authority	84,436
Outlays	11,185
Revised Spending Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	3,169,583
Outlays	3,112,609

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

$s in millions	2018
Current Allocation:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	553,743
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	552,266
General Purpose Outlays	1,188,350
Adjustments:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	1,170
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	83,266
General Purpose Outlays	11,185
Revised Allocation:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	554,913
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	635,532
General Purpose Outlays	1,199,535

	OCO	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Total
Memorandum: Detail of Adjustments Made Above:					
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	0	1,170	1,170
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	0	83,266	83,266
General Purpose Outlays	0	0	0	0	11,185

ANNIVERSARY OF PROTESTS IN BAHRAIN

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, in a truly dubious distinction, this week marks the 7th year since tens of thousands of Bahraini citizens took to the streets of Manama in protest.

These brave men and women put themselves at great risk to demand greater access to their political system and more accountability from their government.

Rather than engage these protestors in meaningful dialogue, the regime responded with violence, tear gas, and rubber bullets.

After much international attention, Bahrain's King agreed to set up the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry, or BICI, and to fully implement its recommended reforms.

I say to the Senate today, on the seventh anniversary of the demonstrations, that the regime has not upheld this fundamental commitment.

In fact, the situation has only grown worse over the past 12 months as the regime has actually taken a number of huge steps back.

In January of 2017, the regime restored arrest and detainment powers to Bahrain's National Security Agency, despite that agency's past involvement in torture and coercion of political prisoners.

Later in the year, the King approved a constitutional amendment allowing military courts to try Bahraini citizens, a move Amnesty International called ''disastrous'' and warned would be used to crack down on political opposition.

These policies are fundamentally at odds with the BICI recommendations and make clear what folks in international human rights community have long said, that the regime has no intention of upholding its commitment.

The State Department last certified in 2013 that the regime had fully implemented a mere handful of the BICI recommendations. The last State Department update, in 2016, failed to identify any further progress taken.

Last year a panel of UN human rights experts noted a ''sharp deterioration of the human rights situation in the country . . . aimed at muzzling any discordant voice and suppressing dissent.''

The State Department's most recent Human Rights Report details the Bahraini regime's willingness to revoke citizenship as a punishment, often without providing a concrete justification and without an opportunity for basic due process.

A Washington Post story from last year indicated the regime revoked citizenship from more than 100 Bahrainis

in the first half of 2017, and reports indicate the regime issued deportation orders to eight Bahrainis just last month after stripping them of citizenship.

A number of organizations, including Human Rights Watch and Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain, have echoed these observations.

Regrettably, the Trump administration has done almost nothing to push Bahrain's leaders to fulfill their commitments and do better by their own citizens.

Why would they when the Embassy of Bahrain is throwing lavish parties at the Trump Hotel right here in DC?

As I try to make clear every year, these observations, which have become a sad tradition of mine, are not an attempt to undermine Bahrain's government.

Bahrain has been a longtime U.S. ally and a partner in a region where partnership can be difficult to come by, but precisely because of our close ties, I feel compelled to speak out when I see such blatant repression of basic human rights.

Oregonians—indeed, Americans—expect their elected officials to hold our international partners to a higher standard. And that is what I am doing here today.

I renew my call on the Bahrain's monarchy to halt its deliberate campaign of silencing peaceful opposition, to stop the indefensible revocation of citizenships, and to release political prisoners like Nabeel Rajab and Abdulhadi al-Khawaja.

I fear that only then will Bahrain be able to move forward together in peace and prosperity, and I look forward to that day.

TRIBUTE TO JANET YELLEN

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I wish to say a few words about Janet Yellen, an outstanding public servant, who recently completed her term as Chair of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and stepped down from the Board. At different times, over 42 years, she served the Fed as staff economist, member of the Board, president of the San Francisco Fed, Vice Chair, and then Chair. Under her leadership, the Fed began the process of normalizing monetary policy by winding down its balance sheet and raising interest rates after years at the zero lower bound.

Twice yearly, Ms. Yellen reported to the Banking Committee on monetary policy, conscientiously answering questions from members and was helpful in enlisting Federal Reserve staff to respond to inquiries from committee members and staff. I have appreciated her willingness to engage constructively with me and members of the committee as we have worked on legislation to tailor regulations and promote a healthy economy.

Over the years, I found Ms. Yellen to be serious, engaging, and generous with her time, a sentiment that is widely shared in this body. I thank her for her service.

2018 WHITE HOUSE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION CHRISTMAS ORNAMENT HONORING PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senate to join me today in recognizing, celebrating, and highlighting the upcoming presentation of the 2018 White House Historical Association Ornament that honors Missouri native and 33rd U.S. President, Harry S. Truman.

The 2018 White House Historical Association Christmas Ornament will be presented this President's Day in President Truman's hometown, Independence, MO, at the Harry S. Truman Presidential Library and Museum. The ornament is designed to highlight the positive changes President Truman made to the White House while in office.

The front side of the ornament features the Truman balcony added in 1947–48 to the south portico that allowed his family outdoor access from their upstairs living area and is still a popular location for First Families and their guests. The back side features the renovated Blue Room, home to the official White House Christmas Tree. President Truman's White House alterations and restorations were the most work done since President George Washington built the Executive mansion and Presidents James Madison and James Monroe restored it after it was damaged by fire in the War of 1812.

The Presidential Seal, located at the top of the ornament, was implemented by President Truman in 1945. Originally, the American eagle looked left towards its talons that held a cluster of spears, representing weapons of war. President Truman redesigned the seal so the American eagle faced towards its right talons, which hold the olive branches of peace.

I am so proud to hold the seat that Senator Truman held for 10 years.

President Truman lived in Missouri his entire life, with exception to his years in government service. His strong work ethic and taste for politics developed early, working as a clerk for his father who was an election judge and participating in farming, bank clerking, and timekeeping. His strong sense of patriotism led him to join the Missouri Army National Guard in 1905 and later return to Active Duty when World War I began in 1917, where he served as a first lieutenant in the U.S. Army field artillery. After the war, he married Bess and was elected county judge of the eastern district of Jackson County. In 1934, he was elected to the U.S. Senate and reelected by large margins in 1940.

In 1944, then-Senator Truman was chosen to be the Vice Presidential candidate to President Franklin Roosevelt after a successful career in Congress revealing fraud in government wartime spending. Few Presidents after President Truman have faced the hardships he had awaiting him following the death of President Roosevelt and his succession to the Presidency in the spring of 1945.

President Truman ended the largest and most devastating war in world history and began to rebuild the defeated Axis Powers shortly after. Rebuilding war-torn countries of former enemies had never been completed; however, President Truman did so successfully through the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan. He was a strong negotiator in international affairs and oversaw the founding of the United Nations.

President Truman left behind a highly respected legacy, and because of leaders like him, who fought hard and made difficult decisions, our country and world is a better place.

I ask that the Senate join me in celebrating the 2018 White House Historical Association Christmas Ornament honoring President Harry S. Truman.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY R. MAZZA

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Nancy R. Mazza and congratulate her on her dedicated service to the people of North Carolina.

Nancy previously worked for esteemed Congressman Howard Coble, a dear friend who served North Carolina for three decades and passed away in 2015. After Congressman Coble's retirement in 2014, I was fortunate enough to hire Nancy in my High Point office.

Nancy's addition to my team was instrumental in getting our constituent service operation off the ground and running. Nancy has been an absolutely indispensable mentor and leader on our team. She has trained many of our staff members, generously sharing her wealth of casework experience and expertise.

Over the course of her distinguished career, Nancy has helped expedite thousands of passports, assisted countless veterans who were struggling to get answers and service from the VA, and inquired on behalf of many other North Carolinians when they needed assistance and had nowhere else to turn.

Anyone who has ever interacted with Nancy can immediately tell that she has a heart of gold and a dedicated passion for public service that is driven by kindness and compassion.

While Nancy Mazza will be sorely missed by our office, I am eternally grateful for the work that she did on behalf on North Carolinians. I wish her the very best in retirement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. REED L. MOSHER

• Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend Dr. Reed L. Mosher for over 38 years of service to the Nation.

Dr. Mosher will soon retire as the director of the Information Technology Laboratory, ITL, of the Corps Engineer Research and Development Center, ERDC, headquartered in Vicksburg, MS. His astonishing list of accomplishments range from leading research and development for the Corps, the Army, the Department of Defense, and multiple Federal agencies, to leading the transformation of DOD's research and acquisition communities through the strategic application of high-performance computing, high-speed networks, computational expertise, system engineering, large-scale data analytics, and technology transfer. He instilled a culture of innovation, adaptability, and shared knowledge. Dr. Mosher created a visionary atmosphere where team members are empowered to expand the breadth and depth of data analytics capabilities and explore the future of information management and information technology.

During his more than 38-year service to the Nation, Dr. Reed L. Mosher exuded extraordinary leadership with unparalleled vision, compassion, competence, and determination, culminating with his tenure as the director of the ITL, the premier defense laboratory for information technology. His initiative and selfless service in the successful execution of a broad range of decisive research, development, studies, and operational programs in support of military engineering and Army civil works have resulted in lasting contributions to the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, and the Nation.

I am pleased to commend Dr. Mosher for his many years of service and to wish him well in the years ahead.●

REMEMBERING SHEILA ANN OLSEN

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, my colleague Senator JIM RISCH joins me today in honoring the extraordinary life of Sheila Ann Olsen, of Idaho Falls, ID, a dear friend and leader.

Sheila cared deeply for others as was clear from her community involvement. She devoted countless hours to assisting fellow Idahoans and bettering our communities. Some of the organizations and efforts she led and served in include the Idaho Commission on Human Rights, the Development Workshop Foundation, the Mayor's Committee on Race Relations, the Mayor's Cultural Awareness and Human Relations Committee, the Idaho Falls ADA Accessibility Commission, the ''Unity in the Community'' Prayer-a-Thon, the Governor's Workforce Development Council, Brigham Young University Alumni Board member, Idaho Department of Labor Employment Security Advisory Council, and the Electoral College. She was a dedicated member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and a leader in the local and State Republican Party. Sheila is broadly admired for her giving spirit, and many credit Sheila with her help in advancing them on their career paths.

While she was deeply principled and committed to her religious faith, she worked extensively with and greatly valued working with others of differing faiths and backgrounds. She sought common ground and held high regard for bridging faiths, races, and backgrounds. We echo the descriptions of Sheila esteemed by her family and many friends: joyful, positive, engaged, compassionate, kind, fair, good, patriotic, and well-respected. Her attributes and hard work have received many recognitions including ''National MS Mother of the Year'' by President George H.W. Bush, Brigham Young University's ''Service to Family Award,'' ''Exemplary Citizen'' by the Rotary Club, and many more.

Sheila Olsen will be remembered as someone who set an enduring example of service to others. She was a mother of 10 children and a wife to the late Dennis Olsen. She was a grandmother to 39 grandchildren and great-grandmother to 23 great-grandchildren. She overcame the complications of multiple sclerosis to give extensively. Her legacy of devotion to her family, her religion, and serving will carry on in the many lives positively influenced by this great leader. We express our deep condolences to her family and friends and thank Sheila for her friendship and lasting service.●

RECOGNIZING BLACKFEET COMMUNITY COLLEGE

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Blackfeet Community College, BCC. By 2020, BCC hopes to produce 40 certified teachers for Montana, and these teachers will be able to integrate Blackfeet culture into their classrooms.

BCC is operated exclusively for nonprofit purposes, ensuring that postsecondary and higher educational services are provided to the community. BCC students, staff and board of trustees have adopted core values that recognize the way our interactions with others effect our value and thought systems. The first core value is the Blackfeet Way of Knowing, which means Blackfeet culture/spirituality in philosophy, thought, and action.

BCC is raising up leaders of tomorrow who are rooted in the Blackfeet culture and heritage, a heritage that is known for traditional singing, drumming, and dancing, as well as stick games and rodeos.

Thank you, BCC, for your continued dedication to creating the thoughtful and values-driven Montana teachers and leaders of tomorrow.●

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT BADAL

● Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate President Robert Badal of the University of Jamestown, formerly known as Jamestown College, in Jamestown, ND, on his outstanding tenure. Since 2002, Dr. Badal's leadership has brought strengthened academic programs, increased enrollment, greater financial strength, and significant expansion and renovation of the campus. These efforts and new offerings of graduate programs led to the change of status from college to university under Dr. Badal, who will be retiring on February 28, 2018.

In addition to jumpstarting graduate programs, Dr. Badal has also more than doubled the endowment of the university and expanded academic offerings and extracurricular offering, and it currently celebrates a multi-year high enrollment of 1,136 students. Additionally, the university has reached to other parts of North Dakota by establishing a campus in Fargo with three graduate programs. To quote Dr. Badal, he has taken ''a small, but historic institution to a higher level.''

The University of Jamestown was truly fortunate to have a president whose unwavering passion and dedication to student success led to extraordinary growth and advancement. While his departure marks a new era for the university, he has left it in a very strong position for the future and for his successor. I thank Dr. Badal for his time and leadership at the University of Jamestown and wish him a very enjoyable retirement.●

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF THE ELKS

● Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, February 16, 2018, marks the 150th anniversary of the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks. The Elks is an American fraternal society dedicated to serving and caring for our citizens, communities, and country. The order continues to grow and thrive with a membership of nearly 1 million members and 2,000 lodges nationwide.

The Elks is dedicated to the ideals of charity, justice, and patriotism and has invested millions of hours annually in building stronger communities, assisting homeless veterans, and supporting youth substance abuse prevention initiatives.

Patriotism is central to the order's principles and is demonstrated in some of the organization's charitable endeavors. In 1907, the Elks first adopted June 14 as Flag Day out of reverence for the American flag and the sacrifices made in honor of it. Almost 40 years later, Congress officially recognized June 14 as the national holiday honoring the American flag. Elks members donated over 1 million for the renovation of the Statue of Liberty, which helped to restore this important symbol of freedom. Elks members also contributed nearly 2 million for the building of the National World War II Memorial in honor of the more than 16,000,000 people who served in the Second World War.

The Order of the Elks has demonstrated a strong commitment to serving our county's veterans. The Elks are deeply engaged in the Veterans Affairs medical facilities by providing support and friendship to veterans at VA facilities. Furthermore, the Elks answered the call of the Department of Veterans Affairs to better address veteran homelessness by founding the Welcome Home Program.

Providing mentorship and instilling good character and moral values in our country's youth is another important facet of the Elk's mission. Our youth are the leaders of tomorrow, and the Elks are committed to helping them succeed by supporting scholarships that allow more children to pursue their dreams. Further, the order educates parents and their children about the dangers of using illegal substances, tobacco products, alcohol, and abusing prescription drugs. These prevention and awareness programs help give young people the tools and information they need to make good decisions when faced with negative social pressures.

I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to join me in recognizing and congratulating the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks on its 150th anniversary. The Order of the Elks has been and will continue to be a shining example of honor and service to neighbor, community, and nation.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL RUBIN

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, today, I pay tribute to Rhode Island's assistant attorney general Michael Rubin, who will retire this year after serving our State for more than three decades. I had the pleasure of working alongside Mike during my time as attorney general and during my time on the attorney general office staff. I am proud to call him my friend. He is a skilled leader in the Rhode Island legal community. He will be missed.

Mike piled up a strong record of accomplishments during his time as the assistant attorney general of Rhode Island and chief of the Rhode Island Attorney General's environmental unit. He was an advocate for every community in the State and worked every day to promote a safe, clean environment for our kids and preserve public access to our beautiful shores. Just this past year, Save the Bay Rhode Island awarded Mike with its Environmental Achievement Award for his important work as the head of the environmental unit. ''Without the efforts of advocates such as Mike, who tirelessly work not only for the good of the environment, but for our ability as a citizenry to access and enjoy our coastline, the quality, and in some cases, quantity, of publicly accessible coastal lands and waters would be significantly depreciated,'' the organization announced.

I got to see his determination firsthand when I was attorney general. In 2001, Mike had been trial counsel in the State proceedings when I argued a case to defend our State's environmental preservation regulations before the Supreme Court. More recently, Mike helped file lawsuits in 2016 against dozens of big oil companies over the hazardous messes they were making in Rhode Island wells and reservoirs and pursued $65 million for the cleanup.

In addition to his good work in the attorney general's office, Mike has contributed a great deal to our community. I know he will remain a committed leader in our State. I wish him health and much happiness in his days to come. Here is to less time writing briefs and more time enjoying Rhode Island's natural beauty, whether that be on your bike, in your kayak, or on your ice-skates.

On behalf of all Rhode Islanders, thank you for your work, Mike. You have made our State proud. Godspeed.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:24 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3299. An act to amend the Revised Statutes, the Home Owners' Loan Act, the Federal Credit Union Act, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require the rate of interest on certain loans remain unchanged after transfer of the loan, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3542. An act to impose sanctions against Hamas for violating universally applicable international laws of armed conflict by intentionally using civilians and civilian property to shield military objectives from lawful attack, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3978. An act to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures, and for other purposes.

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

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 3299. An act to amend the Revised Statutes, the Home Owners' Loan Act, the Federal Credit Union Act, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require the rate of interest on certain loans remain unchanged after transfer of the loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3542. An act to impose sanctions against Hamas for violating universally applicable international laws of armed conflict by intentionally using civilians and civilian property to shield military objectives from lawful attack, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 3978. An act to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–4336. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's proposed fiscal year 2019 Budget and Performance Plan; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4337. A communication from the Acting Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bureau's strategic plan for fiscal years 2018–2022; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4338. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Emergency Preparedness and Operations Reliability Standards'' (Docket No. RM11–12–000; Order No. 840) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4339. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modified Safe Harbor for Deteriorating Concrete Foundations Caused by the Mineral Pyrrhotite'' (Rev. Proc. 2018–14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4340. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Exemption Application Rules for Corporate Restructurings'' (Rev. Proc. 2018–15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4341. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Qualified Opportunity Zones Designation Procedures'' (Rev. Proc. 2018–16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4342. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of

Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4343. A communication from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2017 annual report of Military Assistance and Military Exports; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4344. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Ames Laboratory in Ames, Iowa, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4345. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Management of Traumatic Brain Injury in Children''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4346. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–241, ''Controlled Substance Testing Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4347. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–242, ''Medical Necessity Review Criteria Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4348. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–243, ''Personal Delivery Device Pilot Program Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4349. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–244, ''Homeless Shelter Replacement Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4350. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–245, ''Master Development Plan Recognition Temporary Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4351. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–246, ''Defending Access to Women's Health Care Services Amendnent Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4352. A communication from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's strategic plan for fiscal years 2018 - 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4353. A communication from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's strategic plan for fiscal years 2018 - 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4354. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 14, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4355. A communication from the Chairman of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Buy American Act Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4356. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of MT–45 Into Schedule I'' (Docket No. DEA–451) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4357. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of 4-Fluoroisobutyryl Fentanyl Into Schedule I'' (Docket No. DEA–452) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4358. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of ortho-Fluorofentanyl, Tetrahydrofuranyl, Fentanyl, and Methoxyacetyl Fentanyl Into Schedule I'' (Docket No. DEA–473) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4359. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of FUB–AMB Into Schedule I'' (Docket No. DEA–472) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4360. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Acryl Fentanyl Into Schedule I'' (Docket No. DEA–460) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4361. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Six Synthetic Cannabinoids (5F–ADB, 5F–AMB, 5F–APINACA, ADB–FUBINACA, MDMB–CHMICA and MDMB–FUBINACA) Into Schedule I'' (Docket No. DEA–446) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–172. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, urging the United States Congress to reject the proposed elimination of the 20 percent investment tax credit provided under the United States tax code for projects that rehabilitate, restore, or preserve historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

POM–173. A resolution adopted by the Lauderdale Lakes City Commission, Lauderdale Lakes, Florida memorializing its opposition to all expressions of hatred and bigotry, especially those made by public officials relative to immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 294. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the ''Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building''.

H.R. 452. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the ''Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office''.

S. 931. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the ''George Sakato Post Office''.

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

H.R. 1207. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 River Street in Tilden, Texas, as the ''Tilden Veterans Post Office''.

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1208. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9155 Schaefer Road, Converse, Texas, as the ''Converse Veterans Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1858. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the ''Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office''.

H.R. 1988. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the ''Merle Haggard Post Office Building''.

S. 2040. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 621 Kansas Avenue in Atchison, Kansas, as the ''Amelia Earhart Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2254. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the ''Janet Capello Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2302. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the ''Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 2464. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the ''John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office''.

H.R. 2672. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Carter Street in Fairview, Illinois, as the ''Sgt. Douglas J. Riney Post Office''.

H.R. 2815. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the ''Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office''.

H.R. 2873. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 Glenside Avenue in Wyncote, Pennsylvania, as the ''Staff Sergeant Peter Taub Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3109. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the ''Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3369. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 225 North Main Street in Spring Lake, North Carolina, as the ''Howard B. Pate, Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 3638. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Kings Road in Jacksonville, Florida, as the ''Rutledge Pearson Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3655. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Main Street in Belmar, New Jersey, as the ''Dr. Walter S. McAfee Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3821. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 Main Street in Clermont, Georgia, as the ''Zach T. Addington Post Office''.

H.R. 3893. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Mathe Avenue in Interlachen, Florida, as the ''Robert H. Jenkins, Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 4042. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the ''Borinqueneers Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4285. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 Bridgeton Pike in Mullica Hill, New Jersey, as the ''James C. 'Billy' Johnson Post Office Building''.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

Dennis Shea, of Virginia, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Geneva Office), with the rank of Ambassador.

C. J. Mahoney, of Kansas, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Investment, Services, Labor, Environment, Africa, China , and the Western Hemisphere), with the rank of Ambassador.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Michael B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Daniel Desmond Domenico, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

Susan Paradise Baxter, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Marilyn Jean Horan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Adam I. Klein, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman and Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2024.

McGregor W. Scott, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of California for the term of four years.

Gary G. Schofield, of Nevada, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada for the term of four years.

By Mr. BURR for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Michael K. Atkinson, of Maryland, to be Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, Office of the Director of National Intelligence .

*Jason Klitenic, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2431. A bill to ensure that certain incidents involving a covered employee that are reported to the title IX coordinator at an eligible institution of higher education have been reviewed by the president of the institution and not less than 1 additional member of the institution's board of trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. JONES):

S. 2432. A bill to amend the charter of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2433. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 2434. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2435. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the number of local wage areas allowable within a General Schedule pay locality; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2436. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the amount of certain qualified conservation contributions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 2437. A bill to reauthorize and improve the 21st Century Cures opioid grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. NELSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2438. A bill to conduct or support further comprehensive research for the creation of a universal influenza vaccine; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 2439. A bill to establish a pilot toll credit marketplace program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 2440. A bill to combat the opioid epidemic by reforming existing laws and providing for the public's safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2441. A bill to amend the Steel Industry American Heritage Area Act of 1996 to repeal the funding limitation; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 2442. A bill to establish a Federal tax credit approximation matching program for State new jobs training tax credits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2443. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a new career counseling program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2444. A bill to provide for enhanced energy grid security; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2445. A bill to provide for the modernization of the electric grid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 2446. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for patient protection by establishing safe nurse staffing levels at certain Medicare providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2447. A bill to accelerate smart building development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COONS, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2448. A bill to provide for the issuance of a rule to advance next-generation technologies to provide alternatives to hydrofluorocarbons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2449. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish the 21st Century Energy Workforce Advisory Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2450. A bill to require the Bureau of the Census to conduct a survey to determine income and poverty levels in the United States in a manner that accounts for the receipt of Federal means-tested benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental 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. COONS (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. Res. 407. A resolution recognizing the critical work of human rights defenders in promoting human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and good governance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 408. A resolution commemorating the 59th anniversary of Tibet's 1959 uprising as ''Tibetan Rights Day'', and expressing support for the human rights and religious freedom of the Tibetan people and the Tibetan Buddhist faith community; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 409. A resolution honoring the dedication and courage of the Buffalo Soldiers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 410. A resolution commemorating the life of Luis Alejandro ''Alex'' Villamayor and calling for justice and accountability; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BURR, and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 411. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the first 9-1-1 call in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. Res. 412. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion and celebrating Black History Month; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. JONES, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. Res. 413. A resolution celebrating Black History Month; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) 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. 309

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 309, a bill to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 946, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1086

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1086, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1091, a bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

S. 1403

At the request of Mr. DAINES, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1403, a bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to establish the 21st Century Conservation Service Corps to place youth and veterans in national service positions to conserve, restore, and enhance the great outdoors of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1730

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1730, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1871

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1871, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the role of podiatrists in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1917

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1917, a bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2072

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2072, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take action to eliminate human exposure to asbestos, and for other purposes.

S. 2095

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2095, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 2127

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2127, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 2136

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2136, a bill to expand the monthly payments that may be eligible for public service loan forgiveness.

S. 2155

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

S. 2184

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2184, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve veterans' health care benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 2270

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2270, a bill to make improvements to the account for the State response to the opioid abuse crisis to improve tribal health.

S. 2271

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr.

KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2271, a bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act.

S. 2324

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2324, a bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to change certain requirements relating to the capital structure of business development companies, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise certain rules relating to business development companies, and for other purposes.

S. 2329

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

S. 2372

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2372, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

AMENDMENT NO. 1953

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1953 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2579, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

AMENDMENT NO. 1954

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1954 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2579, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

AMENDMENT NO. 1958

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1958 proposed to H.R. 2579, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

AMENDMENT NO. 1959

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1959 proposed to H.R. 2579, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

AMENDMENT NO. 2010

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2010 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2579, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2436. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the amount of certain qualified conservation contributions; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 2436

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 ''Charitable Conservation Easement Program Integrity Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON PARTNER'S DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY PARTNERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 170(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) LIMITATION ON PARTNERSHIP ALLOCATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any qualified conservation contributions of any partnership (whether directly or as a distributive share of such contributions of another partnership), no amount of such contributions may be taken into account under this section by any partner of such partnership as a distributive share of such contributions if the aggregate amount so taken into account by such partner for the taxable year would (but for this paragraph) exceed 2.5 times such partner's adjusted basis in such partnership (determined as of the close of such taxable year and without regard to such contributions). The preceding sentence shall apply only with respect to the first 5 taxable years of such partner which end after the date on which such partner first became a partner in the partnership.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any partnership if substantially all of the partnership interests in such partnership are held by individuals who are related within the meaning of section 152(d)(2).

''(C) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary to carry out, and prevent the avoidance of, the purposes of this paragraph.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply to contributions made after December 23, 2016. No inference is intended as the appropriate treatment of contributions made on or before such date or as to any activity not described in section 170(h)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 407—RECOGNIZING THE CRITICAL WORK OF HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS IN PROMOTING HUMAN RIGHTS, THE RULE OF LAW, DEMOCRACY, AND GOOD GOVERNANCE

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 407

Whereas the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (referred to in this preamble as the ''Declaration on Human Rights Defenders'')—

(1) was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 9, 1998; and

(2) states that, ''Everyone has the right . . . to promote and to strive for the protection and realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms at the national and international levels'';

Whereas the Department of State defines ''human rights defenders'' as ''individuals, working alone or in groups, who non-violently advocate for the promotion and protection of universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms'';

Whereas the Senate supports the right of human rights defenders all over the world to promote the fundamental freedoms enshrined in—

(1) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted at Paris on December 10, 1948; and

(2) human rights treaties;

Whereas human rights defenders protect the rights of vulnerable individuals and groups;

Whereas, according to Amnesty International, an estimated 3,500 human rights defenders have been murdered since the adoption of the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders;

Whereas, in certain parts of the world, the work of human rights defenders is threatened through—

(1) restrictions on—

(A) the press; and

(B) the freedoms of expression, assembly, and association;

(2) smear campaigns;

(3) arbitrary detentions;

(4) laws restricting the funding and registration of human rights organizations;

(5) physical attacks;

(6) enforced disappearances;

(7) impunity with respect to crimes committed against human rights defenders; and

(8) abuses of—

(A) antiterrorism legislation; and

(B) states of emergency; and

Whereas, in the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2016 of the Department of State, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson noted the commitment of the

United States to ''the human rights guaranteed to all individuals around the world'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends human rights defenders for their critical work in promoting human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and good governance;

(2) recognizes the rights of human rights defenders to the freedoms of association, assembly, and expression, including the rights of those individuals to collect and publish data on government abuses;

(3) condemns all threats to—

(A) human rights defenders; and

(B) the work of human rights defenders in promoting universally recognized human rights;

(4) welcomes the imposition of sanctions by the President, on December 21, 2017, and under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note), with respect to human rights abusers and corrupt actors;

(5) encourages all countries to recognize their duties under the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 9, 1998, to ''protect, promote and implement all human rights and fundamental freedoms''; and

(6) calls on the President and Secretary of State to maintain leadership by the United States in promoting human rights.

SENATE RESOLUTION 408—COMMEMORATING THE 59TH ANNIVERSARY OF TIBET'S 1959 UPRISING AS ''TIBETAN RIGHTS DAY'', AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE HUMAN RIGHTS AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM OF THE TIBETAN PEOPLE AND THE TIBETAN BUDDHIST FAITH COMMUNITY

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 408

Whereas March 10, 2018, marks the 59th anniversary of the 1959 uprising in Tibet, during which the people of Lhasa, fearing for the life of the Dalai Lama, surrounded his residence, organized a guard, and called for the withdrawal of Chinese forces from Tibet and the restoration of Tibet's freedom;

Whereas Chinese statistics estimate 87,000 Tibetans were killed, arrested, or deported to labor camps during the suppression of the 1959 uprising, which also forced the Dalai Lama and tens of thousands of other Tibetans to flee into exile;

Whereas March 10, 2018, also marks the 10th anniversary of a series of protests in Lhasa, which spread across Tibet, and which were suppressed by Chinese forces;

Whereas, according to the Department of State, the Government of the People's Republic of China is engaged in the severe repression of Tibet's unique religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage, and is engaged in gross violations of human rights in Tibet, including extrajudicial detentions, disappearances, and torture;

Whereas, in the ten years since the 2008 protests, at least 152 Tibetans in Tibet are known to have self-immolated, with statements or records left by these self-immolators calling for freedom for Tibet and the return of the Dalai Lama;

Whereas, in 1991, Congress resolved its sense that Tibet is an occupied country under the established principles of international law whose true representatives are the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan government in exile as recognized by the Tibetan people;

Whereas, in 1961, with the support of the United States, the United Nations General Assembly recognized the Tibetan people's ''fundamental human rights and freedoms, including the right to self-determination'';

Whereas, on October 18, 2007, Congress awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to the Dalai Lama, finding that he is recognized around the world as a leading figure of moral and religious authority, and is the unrivaled spiritual and cultural leader of the Tibetan people;

Whereas Buddhists in Tibet, the United States, India, Nepal, Bhutan, Mongolia, Russia, and other countries where followers of Tibetan Buddhism reside look to the Dalai Lama for religious leadership and spiritual guidance;

Whereas, in its 2017 annual report, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom noted that ''[t]he Chinese government claims the power to select the next Dalai Lama with the help of a law that grants the government authority over reincarnations,'' which purports to require all Tibetan Buddhist leaders to obtain the approval of the Government of the People's Republic of China in order to reincarnate;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has interfered in the identification and installation of reincarnated leaders of Tibetan Buddhism, as part of its efforts to maintain control over Tibet, including in 1995 arbitrarily detaining the recently identified 11th Panchen Lama, then a six-year-old boy, and purporting to install China's own candidate as Panchen Lama;

Whereas, in 2011, the 14th Dalai Lama declared that the responsibility for identifying a future 15th Dalai Lama will rest with officials of the Dalai Lama's private office and that ''apart from the reincarnation recognized through such legitimate methods, no recognition or acceptance should be given to a candidate chosen for political ends by anyone, including those in the People's Republic of China'';

Whereas, in 1981, the United Nations General Assembly passed the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, which provides that freedom of religion shall include the freedom to ''train, appoint, elect or designate by succession appropriate leaders called for by the requirements and standards of any religion or belief''; and

Whereas Congress has long held that the right to freedom of religion undergirds the very origin and existence of the United States, and that freedom of religious belief and practice is a universal human right and fundamental freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes March 10, 2018, as ''Tibetan Rights Day'';

(2) affirms its recognition of His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama for his outstanding contributions to peace, nonviolence, human rights, and religious understanding;

(3) affirms its support for the Tibetan people's fundamental human rights and freedoms, including their right to self-determination and the protection of their distinct religious, cultural, linguistic, and national identity;

(4) expresses its sense that the identification and installation of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders, including a future 15th Dalai Lama, is a matter that should be determined solely within the Tibetan Buddhist faith community, in accordance with the inalienable right to religious freedom;

(5) expresses its sense that any attempt by the Government of the People's Republic of China to identify or install its own candidate as a Tibetan Buddhist religious leader, including a future 15th Dalai Lama, is invalid interference in the right to religious freedom of Tibetan Buddhists around the world, including in Tibet as well as the United States and elsewhere; and

(6) calls on the Secretary of State to fully implement the provisions of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (subtitle B of title VI of Public Law 107–228; 22 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), in cooperation with like-minded states where appropriate, including that—

(A) representatives of the United States Government in exchanges with officials of the Government of the People's Republic of China should call for and otherwise promote the cessation of all interference by the Government of the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party in the religious affairs of the Tibetan people;

(B) the United States Ambassador to the People's Republic of China should meet with the 11th Panchen Lama, who was arbitrarily detained on May 17, 1995, and otherwise ascertain information concerning his whereabouts and well-being; and

(C) the Secretary of State should make best efforts to establish an office in Lhasa, Tibet, to monitor political, economic, and cultural developments in Tibet.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators FEINSTEIN and CRUZ in cosponsoring a resolution recognizing the 59th anniversary of the Tibetan uprising against Chinese rule—March 10, 2018 as ''Tibetan Rights Day.''

Fifty-nine years ago, Tibetans took a stand, together, for the freedom of their homeland. The people of the Tibetan capital, Lhasa, fearing for the life of the Dalai Lama, surrounded his residence, organized a guard, and called for the withdrawal of Chinese forces from Tibet and the restoration of Tibet's freedom. Chinese statistics estimate 87,000 Tibetans were killed, arrested, or deported to labor camps during the suppression of the 1959 uprising, which also led to the forced exile of the Dalai Lama and tens of thousands of other Tibetans.

Today, 59 years later, the Government of the People's Republic of China remains engaged in the severe repression of Tibet's unique religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage, and is engaged in gross violations of human rights in Tibet, including extrajudicial detentions, disappearances, and torture. At least 152 Tibetans in Tibet are known to have self-immolated in protest in the past decade. Yet the Tibetan people have not given up their struggle for fundamental human rights and freedoms. We stand by the Tibetan people, who have long been our unwavering friends.

We also stand by the rights of Tibetan Buddhists, not just in Tibet but around the world, who should be able to determine their own religious leadership in accordance with their inalienable right to religious freedom. According to the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, the Chinese government claims the power to

select the next Dalai Lama with the help of a law that grants the government authority over reincarnations. That is absurd. The identification and installation of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders, including a future 15th Dalai Lama, is a matter that should be determined solely within the Tibetan Buddhist faith community.

We can foster closer, cooperative relations with China, but until China works with Tibetan leaders to pursue a new way forward, their reputation in the community of nations, and their ability to act as a global power, will remain deeply tarnished. I urge other Senators to join in support of this resolution, and to pass it before the important anniversary commemoration on March 10, 2018.

SENATE RESOLUTION 409—HONORING THE DEDICATION AND COURAGE OF THE BUFFALO SOLDIERS

Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 409

Whereas by the Act of July 28, 1866 (14 Stat. 332, chapter 299), after the end of the Civil War, African American men were allowed to serve in segregated units of the United States Army;

Whereas the first Buffalo Soldiers were former slaves and former African American soldiers that fought in the Civil War;

Whereas the first Buffalo Soldiers comprised the 9th and 10th cavalry regiments and were the first African Americans to serve in the United States Army during peacetime;

Whereas, in the history of the United States, Buffalo Soldiers have made many significant military contributions and have fought to preserve and protect the United States;

Whereas Buffalo Soldiers fought shoulder-to-shoulder with white soldiers in many battles;

Whereas Buffalo Soldiers were instrumental in the exploration and settlement of land in the West;

Whereas Buffalo Soldiers participated in the tragic history of removing Native Americans from the land on which Native Americans lived;

Whereas Native Americans in the Midwest bestowed the nickname ''Buffalo Soldiers'' to the members of the 9th and 10th cavalry regiments for—

(1) the bravery and courage that the members exhibited; and

(2) the jackets of buffalo fur that the members wore during the cold winter months;

Whereas the Buffalo Soldiers rode alongside Theodore Roosevelt and the Rough Riders in Cuba during the Spanish-American War;

Whereas Buffalo Soldiers were among the first park rangers to serve in the newly created National Park Service under President Theodore Roosevelt;

Whereas Buffalo Soldiers from the 9th, 10th, 24th, and 25th regiments served in Yosemite National Park and Sequoia National Park and helped arrest poachers, fight forest fires, and preserve the natural resources of the United States;

Whereas, serving nobly as park rangers, Buffalo Soldiers—

(1) constructed in Yosemite National Park one of the first arboretums in the United States;

(2) cleared miles of forest;

(3) built trail roads into national parks for the enjoyment of all people in the United States; and

(4) helped build the first trail to the summit of Mount Whitney in Sequoia National Park;

Whereas Buffalo Soldiers were subjected to racial prejudice but continued—

(1) to serve honorably and bravely in the United States Army; and

(2) to fulfill the duties conferred on them with pride and distinction;

Whereas, earning a reputation for being courageous and daring—

(1) more than 200,000 African Americans served in World War I; and

(2) more than 1,000,000 African Americans served in World War II;

Whereas during World War II, Buffalo Soldiers branched out and formed other famous units, including the famed Tuskegee Airmen and the Fighter ''Red Tails'' Group;

Whereas 23 Buffalo Soldiers have received the highest military distinction of the Congressional Medal of Honor;

Whereas, in 1948, President Harry Truman signed Executive Order 9981, which—

(1) stipulated equal treatment and opportunity for all African American service members; and

(2) brought an end to the Buffalo Soldiers;

Whereas Buffalo Soldiers have honorably answered the call to duty, serving with great valor and distinction in the armed forces of the United States;

Whereas the Buffalo Soldiers are a significant part of the history of the United States; and

Whereas there are currently over 20 chapters of the 9th and 10th Cavalry Association in the United States and 1 in Germany: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the dedication and courage of the Buffalo Soldiers;

(2) recognizes the legacy of the Buffalo Soldiers; and

(3) recognizes the contributions that the Buffalo Soldiers have made to the National Park System and to military history in the United States and throughout the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 410—COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF LUIS ALEJANDRO ''ALEX'' VILLAMAYOR AND CALLING FOR JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 410

Whereas United States citizen Luis Alejandro ''Alex'' Villamayor was born on July 3, 1998, to parents Puning Luk Villamayor and Luis Felipe Villamayor in Rockville, Maryland;

Whereas Alex Villamayor is remembered by his family as a smart, loving, and compassionate young man with a good sense of humor, who was committed to his parents, siblings, and friends;

Whereas Alex Villamayor moved with his family at the age of six to Paraguay, where he was a devoted member of his church and always had attention for those less fortunate;

Whereas Alex Villamayor graduated with honors from Paraguay's Pan American International School (PAIS) and was accepted to attend Montgomery College in Maryland in the Fall of 2015;

Whereas Alex Villamayor aspired to study business management and return to Paraguay to pursue a career that would help and support the Paraguayan people;

Whereas Alex Villamayor was murdered on June 27, 2015, in the City of Encarnación in Paraguay;

Whereas Alex Villamayor's death was wrongfully ruled a suicide by Paraguayan authorities before a comprehensive investigation was carried out;

Whereas, in the initial weeks of the investigation, Paraguayan authorities failed to collect blood and DNA samples from individuals present at the scene of the crime, conduct gunshot residue analysis on individuals present at the crime scene, and collect cellular phone records and data from individuals present at the crime scene;

Whereas, in August 2015, Alex Villamayor's body was exhumed for additional forensic examination, which found that he had been raped and physically assaulted prior to his death;

Whereas, in August 2015, Paraguayan prosecutor Olga Wilma Araujo Ayala was suspended from the investigation into and legal case related to Alex Villamayor's death due to mismanagement of the case;

Whereas, in September 2015, Mathias Wilbs, an employee at the property where Alex Villamayor was murdered, admitted in a public interview that he had removed the murder weapon from the crime scene and placed another firearm in Alex Villamayor's hand;

Whereas, in September 2015, Alex Villamayor's death was ruled a homicide and René Hofstetter and Mathias Wilbs were charged with crimes in relation to Alex Villamayor's murder;

Whereas, in October 2015, Paraguayan authorities opened a formal investigation of Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya for his role in Alex Villamayor's murder;

Whereas, in November 2016, Paraguayan authorities dropped the charges against Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya related to Alex Villamayor's murder;

Whereas Members of the United States Congress have urged the Government of Paraguay to invite the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance for the investigation into Alex Villamayor's death and the United States Embassy in Asunción, Paraguay has offered such assistance to Paraguayan authorities;

Whereas, to date, the Government of Paraguay has not invited the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance for the investigation into Alex Villamayor's death;

Whereas the United States embassy in Asunción, Paraguay, and the Department of State have not issued any formal public statements about Alex Villamayor's murder and the many irregularities in the investigation into his death;

Whereas, in February 2017, outgoing United States Ambassador Leslie A. Basset told media outlets that Alex Villamayor ''died under dark circumstances'' and that ''the investigation and the handling of this case has been worrisome''; and

Whereas, as of February 15, 2018, those responsible for Alex Villamayor's murder have

yet to be brought to justice; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the life of United States citizen Luis Alejandro ''Alex'' Villamayor and offers condolences to his family and friends;

(2) expresses profound concern about the lack of justice achieved in Alex Villamayor's case, more than two and one half years after his rape and murder;

(3) urges Paraguayan authorities to invite the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance for the investigation into Alex Villamayor's death;

(4) calls on the Department of State to prioritize justice for Alex Villamayor in its diplomatic engagement with the Government of Paraguay; and

(5) calls on the Department of State to review its procedures for providing services to the families of United States citizens slain or assaulted abroad.

SENATE RESOLUTION 411—RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST 9–1–1 CALL IN THE UNITED STATES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BURR, and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 411

Whereas, prior to the 1960s, the United States did not have a single designated telephone number for the people of the United States to call for help in times of emergency;

Whereas, in late 1967 and early 1968, the Federal Communications Commission and the American Telephone and Telegraph Company developed a proposal to make the digits 9–1–1 the emergency code throughout the United States;

Whereas, on February 16, 1968, the first 9–1–1 call was placed in Haleyville, Alabama;

Whereas, in 1999, Congress passed the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (47 U.S.C. 615 et seq.), designating 9–1–1 as the national emergency telephone number;

Whereas, by the end of the 20th century, nearly 93 percent of the population of the United States, and 96 percent of the land area of the United States, was covered by some type of 9–1–1 service;

Whereas the availability of 9–1–1 as a national emergency number has contributed to the saving of an untold number of lives in the United States;

Whereas the people of the United States are educated from a young age to rely upon the 9–1–1 systems of the United States to reach help in an emergency;

Whereas the takers of 9–1–1 calls, known as public safety telecommunicators, dedicate their lives to answering 9–1–1 calls and helping others;

Whereas those public safety telecommunicators are critical to ensuring the safety of the general public and first responders;

Whereas, every day, public safety telecommunicators—

(1) help to save and to protect lives;

(2) direct help to where it is needed most; and

(3) provide medical instruction, comfort, and reassurance; and

Whereas ongoing efforts to modernize 9–1–1 systems—

(1) will ensure the 9–1–1 infrastructure of the United States remains resilient, robust, and innovative; and

(2) will empower public safety telecommunicators to make increasingly critical contributions to the safety and security of the general public, as well as first responders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the 50th anniversary of the first 9–1–1 call and the establishment of 9–1–1 as the nationwide emergency number;

(2) praises public safety telecommunicators for their lifesaving work;

(3) recognizes the importance of the 9–1–1 systems of the United States and the need for robust and reliable access to those systems; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to celebrate the 50th anniversary of 9–1–1 and the lifesaving contributions of public safety telecommunicators and first responders facilitated by 9–1–1 systems.

SENATE RESOLUTION 412—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE 6888TH CENTRAL POSTAL DIRECTORY BATTALION AND CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. MORAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 412

Whereas, since 1976, the United States has celebrated Black History Month each February to seize the opportunity to honor the accomplishments of African Americans in every area of endeavor throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas the people of the United States honor the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion (referred to in this preamble as the ''6888th''), which was the first and only African-American unit in the Women's Army Corps to deploy overseas during World War II;

Whereas the 6888th served honorably during World War II from January 1945 to March 1946;

Whereas the 6888th trained at Fort Oglethrope, Georgia, and deployed overseas to operate in Birmingham, England, Rouen, France, and Paris, France;

Whereas, while in Europe, the 6888th worked around-the-clock sorting millions of pieces of mail;

Whereas a new monument honoring the women of the 6888th will be erected in the Buffalo Solider Memorial Park in Fort Leavenworth, Kansas;

Whereas the monument will—

(1) feature the commanding officer of the 6888th, Lieutenant Colonel Charity Adams Earley;

(2) list the names of more than 700 soldiers in the Women's Army Corps assigned to the 6888th; and

(3) celebrate the deeds of and sacrifices made by those who served in the 6888th; and

Whereas Black History Month provides all individuals in the United States an opportunity to celebrate the contributions of African Americans, including the remarkable service of the 6888th: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for—

(A) the monument recognizing the service of the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion; and

(B) the mission of the Buffalo Soldier Educational and Historical Committee;

(2) during Black History Month and throughout 2018, encourages all individuals in the United States to celebrate the history of the United States and the important accomplishments and contributions of African Americans; and

(3) appreciates the contributions of and sacrifices made by the soldiers of the Women's Army Corps assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion during World War II, who served honorably and are members of the ''Greatest Generation''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 413—CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. JONES, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 413

Whereas, in 1776, people envisioned the United States as a new nation dedicated to the proposition stated in the Declaration of Independence that ''all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness . . .'';

Whereas Africans were first brought involuntarily to the shores of the United States as early as the 17th century;

Whereas African Americans suffered enslavement and subsequently faced the injustices of lynch mobs, segregation, and denial of the basic and fundamental rights of citizenship;

Whereas, in 2018, the vestiges of those injustices and inequalities remain evident in the society of the United States;

Whereas, in the face of injustices, people of good will and of all races in the United States have distinguished themselves with a commitment to the noble ideals on which the United States was founded and have fought courageously for the rights and freedom of African Americans and others;

Whereas African Americans, such as Lieutenant Colonel Allen Allensworth, Maya Angelou, Arthur Ashe, Jr., James Baldwin, James Beckwourth, Clara Brown, Blanche Bruce, Ralph Bunche, Shirley Chisholm, Holt Collier, Frederick Douglass, W. E. B. Du Bois, Ralph Ellison, Medgar Evers, Alex Haley, Dorothy Height, Jon Hendricks, Lena Horne, Charles Hamilton Houston, Mahalia Jackson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, B.B. King, Martin Luther King, Jr., Coretta Scott King, Thurgood Marshall, Constance Baker Motley, Rosa Parks, Walter Payton, Bill Pickett, Homer Plessy, Bass Reeves, Hiram Revels, Amelia Platts Boynton Robinson, Jackie Robinson, Aaron Shirley, Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, Booker T. Washington, the Greensboro Four, the Tuskegee Airmen, Prince Rogers Nelson, Recy Taylor, Fred Shuttlesworth, Duke Ellington, Langston Hughs, Muhammad Ali, Ella Fitzgerald, Mamie Till, and Edith Savage-Jennings, along with many others, worked against racism to achieve success and to make significant contributions to the economic, educational, political, artistic, athletic, literary, scientific, and technological advancement of the United States;

Whereas the contributions of African Americans from all walks of life throughout the history of the United States reflect the greatness of the United States;

Whereas many African Americans lived, toiled, and died in obscurity, never achieving the recognition those individuals deserved, and yet paved the way for future generations to succeed;

Whereas African Americans continue to serve the United States at the highest levels of business, government, and the military;

Whereas the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass inspired the creation of Negro History Week, the precursor to Black History Month;

Whereas Negro History Week represented the culmination of the efforts of Dr. Carter G. Woodson, the ''Father of Black History'', to enhance knowledge of Black history through The Journal of Negro History, published by the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, which was founded by Dr. Carter G. Woodson and Jesse E. Moorland;

Whereas Black History Month, celebrated during the month of February, originated in 1926 when Dr. Carter G. Woodson set aside a special period in February to recognize the heritage and achievements of Black people in the United States;

Whereas Dr. Carter G. Woodson stated, ''We have a wonderful history behind us. . . . If you are unable to demonstrate to the world that you have this record, the world will say to you, 'You are not worthy to enjoy the blessings of democracy or anything else.' '';

Whereas since its founding, the United States has imperfectly progressed toward noble goals;

Whereas the history of the United States is the story of people regularly affirming high ideals, striving to reach those ideals but often failing, and then struggling to come to terms with the disappointment of that failure, before committing to try again;

Whereas, on November 4, 2008, the people of the United States elected Barack Obama, an African-American man, as President of the United States; and

Whereas, on February 22, 2012, people across the United States celebrated the groundbreaking of the National Museum of African American History and Culture, which opened to the public on September 24, 2016, on the National Mall in Washington, District of Columbia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges that all people of the United States are the recipients of the wealth of history provided by Black culture;

(2) recognizes the importance of Black History Month as an opportunity to reflect on the complex history of the United States, while remaining hopeful and confident about the path ahead;

(3) acknowledges the significance of Black History Month as an important opportunity to commemorate the tremendous contributions of African Americans to the history of the United States;

(4) encourages the celebration of Black History Month to provide a continuing opportunity for all people in the United States to learn from the past and understand the experiences that have shaped the United States; and

(5) agrees that, while the United States began as a divided country, the United States must—

(A) honor the contribution of all pioneers in the United States who have helped to ensure the legacy of the great United States; and

(B) move forward with purpose, united tirelessly as a nation ''indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.''.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2018. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2019. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2020. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2021. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2022. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2023. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2024. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2025. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2026. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2027. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2028. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2029. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2030. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1958 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. KING, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COONS, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2031. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2032. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2033. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2034. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2035. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2036. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2037. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2038. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1959 proposed by Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ISAKSON) to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2039. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1958 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. KING, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COONS, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2040. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. SMITH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2041. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2042. Mr. ALEXANDER (for Mr. FLAKE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 946, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and for other purposes.

SA 2043. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2018. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. EXPEDITED REMOVAL FOR ALIENS INADMISSIBLE ON CRIMINAL OR SECURITY GROUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 238 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1228) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by adding at the end the following: ''or who are subject to terrorism-related grounds for removal'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''Attorney General'' and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security, in the Secretary's sole and unreviewable discretion,''; and

(ii) by striking ''set forth in this subsection or'' and inserting ''set forth in this subsection, in lieu of removal proceedings under'';

(B) in paragraphs (3) and (4), by striking ''Attorney General'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Secretary'';

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking ''described in this section'' and inserting ''described in paragraph (1) or (2)''; and

(ii) by striking ''the Attorney General may grant in the Attorney General's discretion.'' and inserting ''the Secretary or the Attorney General may grant, in the sole and unreviewable discretion of the Secretary or the Attorney General, in any proceeding.'';

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) The Secretary of Homeland Security, in the exercise of discretion, may determine inadmissibility under section 212(a)(2) and issue an order of removal pursuant to the procedures set forth in this subsection, in lieu of removal proceedings under section 240, with respect to an alien who—

''(A) has not been admitted or paroled;

''(B) has not been found to have a credible fear of persecution pursuant to the procedures set forth in 235(b)(1)(B); and

''(C) is not eligible for a waiver of inadmissibility or relief from removal.'';

(3) by redesignating the first subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(4) by redesignating the second subsection (c), as so designated by section 617(b)(13) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–720)), as subsection (e); and

(5) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) REMOVAL OF ALIENS WHO ARE SUBJECT TO TERRORISM-RELATED GROUNDS FOR REMOVAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security—

''(A) notwithstanding section 240, shall—

''(i) determine the inadmissibility of every alien under subclause (I), (II), or (III) of section 212(a)(3)(B)(i), or the deportability of the alien under section 237(a)(4)(B) as a consequence of being described in 1 of such subclauses; and

''(ii) issue an order of removal pursuant to the procedures set forth in this subsection to every alien determined to be inadmissible or deportable on a ground described in clause (i); and

''(B) may—

''(i) determine the inadmissibility of any alien under subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 212(a)(3) (other than subclauses (I), (II), and (III) of section 212(a)(3)(B)(i)), or the deportability of the alien under subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 237(a)(4) (as a consequence of being described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) of section 212(a)(3)(B)(i)); and

''(ii) issue an order of removal pursuant to the procedures set forth in this subsection to every alien determined to be inadmissible or deportable on a ground described in clause (i).

''(2) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not execute any order described in paragraph (1) until 30 days after the date on which such order was issued, unless waived by the alien, to give the alien an opportunity to petition for judicial review under section 242.

''(3) PROCEEDINGS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to govern proceedings under this subsection, which shall require that—

''(A) the alien is given reasonable notice of the charges and of the opportunity described in subparagraph (C);

''(B) the alien has the privilege of being represented (at no expense to the Government) by such counsel, authorized to practice in such proceedings, as the alien shall choose;

''(C) the alien has a reasonable opportunity to inspect the evidence and rebut the charges;

''(D) a determination is made on the record that the individual upon whom the notice for the proceeding under this section is served (either in person or by mail) is, in fact, the alien named in such notice;

''(E) a record is maintained for judicial review; and

''(F) the final order of removal is not adjudicated by the same person who issues the charges.

''(4) LIMITATION ON RELIEF FROM REMOVAL.—No alien described in this subsection shall be eligible for any relief from removal that the Secretary may grant in the Secretary's discretion.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by striking the item relating to section 238 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 238. Expedited removal of aliens convicted of aggravated felonies or who are subject to terrorism-related grounds for removal.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, but shall not apply to aliens who are in removal proceedings under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a) on such date of enactment.

SEC. ____. BARRING AGGRAVATED FELONS, BORDER CHECKPOINT RUNNERS, AND SEX OFFENDERS FROM ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES.

(a) INADMISSIBILITY ON CRIMINAL AND RELATED GROUNDS; WAIVERS.—Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(i) in subclause (I), by striking '', or'' at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in subclause (II), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by inserting after subclause (II) the following:

''(III) a violation of (or a conspiracy or attempt to violate) any statute relating to section 208 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 408) (relating to social security account numbers or social security cards) or section 1028 of title 18, United States Code (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(J) CITIZENSHIP FRAUD.—Any alien convicted of, or who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of, a violation of, or an attempt or a conspiracy to violate, subsection (a) or (b) of section 1425 of title 18, United States Code (relating to the procurement of citizenship or naturalization unlawfully), is inadmissible.

''(K) CERTAIN FIREARM OFFENSES.—Any alien who at any time has been convicted under any law of, admits having committed, or admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of, any law relating to, purchasing, selling, offering for sale, exchanging, using, owning, possessing, or carrying, or of attempting or conspiring to purchase, sell, offer for sale, exchange, use, own, possess, or carry, any weapon, part, or accessory which is a firearm or destructive device (as defined in section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code) in violation of any law, is inadmissible. For purposes of this subparagraph the term 'any law' includes State laws that do not contain an exception for antique firearms. If the State law does not contain an exception for antique firearms, the Secretary or the Attorney General may consider documentary evidence related to the conviction, including, but not limited to, charging documents, plea agreements, plea colloquies, jury instructions, and police reports, to establish that the offense involved at least 1 firearm that is not an antique firearm.

''(L) AGGRAVATED FELONS.—Any alien who has been convicted of an aggravated felony at any time is inadmissible.

''(M) HIGH SPEED FLIGHT.—Any alien who has been convicted of a violation of section 758 of title 18, United States Code (relating to high speed flight from an immigration checkpoint) is inadmissible.

''(N) FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A SEX OFFENDER.—Any alien convicted under section 2250 of title 18, United States Code, is inadmissible.

''(O) CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, OR VIOLATION OF PROTECTION ORDERS; CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN.—

''(i) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE.—Except as provided in subsection (v), any alien who at any time is or has been convicted of a crime involving the use or attempted use of physical force, or threatened use of a deadly weapon, a crime of domestic violence, a crime of stalking, or a crime of child abuse, child neglect, or child abandonment is inadmissible. For purposes of this clause, the term 'crime of domestic violence' has the meaning given the term in section 237(a)(2)(E)(i).

''(ii) VIOLATORS OF PROTECTION ORDERS.—Except as provided in subsection (v), any alien who at any time is or has been enjoined under a protection order issued by a court and whom the court determines has engaged in conduct that violates the portion of a protection order that involves protection against credible threats of violence, repeated harassment, or bodily injury to the person or persons for whom the protection order was issued is inadmissible. For purposes of this clause, the term 'protection order' has the meaning given the term in section 237(a)(2)(E)(ii).'';

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by redesignating clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) as subclauses (I), (II), and (III), respectively;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(C) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as redesignated—

(i) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''The Attorney General''; and

(ii) by striking '', and (E)'', and inserting ''(E), and (K)'';

(D) in the matter following subparagraph (B), as redesignated—

(i) by striking the first 2 sentences and inserting the following:

''(2) A waiver may not be provided under this subsection to an alien—

''(A) who has been convicted of (or who has admitted committing acts that constitute)—

''(i) murder or criminal acts of torture; or

''(ii) an attempt or conspiracy to commit murder or a criminal act involving torture;

''(B) who has been convicted of an aggravated felony; or

''(C) who has been lawfully admitted for permanent residence and who since the date of such admission has not lawfully resided continuously in the United States for at least 7 years immediately preceding the date on which proceedings were initiated to remove the alien from the United States.''; and

(ii) by striking ''No court'' and inserting the following:

''(3) No court'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (t), as added by section 1(b)(2)(B) of Public Law 108–449, as subsection (u); and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(v) WAIVER FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary or the Attorney General is not limited by the criminal court record and may waive the application of subsection (a)(2)(O)(i) (with respect to crimes of domestic violence and crimes of stalking) and subsection (a)(2)(O)(ii), in the case of an alien who has been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty and who is not and was not the primary perpetrator of violence in the relationship, upon a determination that—

''(A) the alien was acting in self-defense;

''(B) the alien was found to have violated a protection order intended to protect the alien; or

''(C) the alien committed or was convicted of committing a crime—

''(i) that did not result in serious bodily injury; and

''(ii) where there was a connection between the crime and the alien's having been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty.

''(2) CREDIBLE EVIDENCE CONSIDERED.—In acting on applications for a waiver under this subsection, the Secretary or the Attorney General shall consider any credible evidence relevant to the application. The determination of what evidence is credible and the weight to be given that evidence shall be within the sole discretion of the Secretary or the Attorney General.''.

(b) DEPORTABILITY; CRIMINAL OFFENSES.—Section 237(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) IDENTIFICATION FRAUD.—Any alien who is convicted of a violation of (or a conspiracy or attempt to violate) an offense relating to section 208 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 408) (relating to social security account numbers or social security cards) or section 1028 of title 18, United States Code (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with identification) is deportable.''.

(c) DEPORTABILITY; CRIMINAL OFFENSES.—Section 237(a)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking '', or'' at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in clause (iii), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

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

''(iv) of a violation of, or an attempt or a conspiracy to violate, subsection (a) or (b) of section 1425 of title 18, United States Code (relating to the unlawful procurement of citizenship or naturalization),''.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) any act that occurred before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) all aliens who are required to establish admissibility on or after such date of enactment; and

(3) all removal, deportation, or exclusion proceedings that are filed, pending, or reopened, on or after such date of enactment.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by this section may not be construed to create eligibility for relief from removal under section 212(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(c)), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, if such eligibility did not exist before such date of enactment.

SA 2019. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY ENFORCEMENT TRANSPARENCY.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Department of Homeland Security Enforcement Transparency Act''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BORDER SECURITY.—The term ''border security'' means the prevention of unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband.

(2) CHECKPOINT.—The term ''checkpoint'' means a location—

(A) at which vehicles or individuals traveling through the location are stopped or boarded by an officer of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the purposes of enforcement of United States laws and regulations and making border security stops; and

(B) that is not located at a port of entry along an international border of the United States.

(3) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIAL.—The term ''law enforcement official'' means—

(A) an officer or agent of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(B) an officer or agent of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; or

(C) an officer or employee of a State or a political subdivision of a State who is carrying out the functions of an immigration officer pursuant to an agreement entered into under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)), pursuant to authorization under title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), or pursuant to any other agreement with the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) PATROL STOP.—The term ''patrol stop'' means seizure or interrogation of a motorist, passenger, or pedestrian initiated anywhere, except as part of an inspection at a port of entry or a primary inspection at a checkpoint.

(5) PRIMARY INSPECTION.—The term ''primary inspection'' means an initial inspection of a vehicle or individual at a checkpoint.

(6) SECONDARY INSPECTION.—The term ''secondary inspection'' means a further inspection of a vehicle or individual that is conducted following a primary inspection.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR DATA COLLECTION REGARDING STOPS AND SEARCHES INTENDED TO ENFORCE BORDER SECURITY.—A law enforcement official who initiates a patrol stop or who detains any individual beyond a brief and limited inquiry, such as a primary inspection at a checkpoint, shall record—

(1) the date, time, and location of the contact;

(2) the law enforcement official's basis for, or circumstances surrounding, the action, including if such individual's perceived race or ethnicity contributed to such basis;

(3) the identifying characteristics of such individual, including the individual's perceived race, gender, ethnicity, and approximate age;

(4) the duration of the stop, detention, or search, whether consent was requested and obtained for detention and any search;

(5) a description of any articulable facts and behavior by the individual that justify initiating a stop or probable cause to justify any search pursuant to such contact;

(6) a description of any items seized during such search, including contraband or money, and a specification of the type of search conducted;

(7) any warning or citation that was issued as a result of such contact and the basis for such warning or citation;

(8) if an arrest or detention was made as a result of such contact, the justification for such arrest or detention;

(9) the immigration status of the individual and whether removal proceedings were subsequently initiated against the individual;

(10) if force was used by the law enforcement official and if force was used, the type of force and justification for using force;

(11) any complaint made by the individual and any follow-up made regarding the complaint;

(12) the badge number of law enforcement official involved in the complaint; and

(13) if the action was initiated by a State or local law enforcement agency—

(A) the reason for involvement of a Federal law enforcement official;

(B) the duration of the stop prior to contact with any Federal law enforcement official;

(C) the method by which a Federal law enforcement official was informed of the stop; and

(D) if the individual was being held by State or local officials on State criminal charges at the time of such contact.

(d) REQUIREMENT FOR U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION DATA COLLECTION REGARDING CHECKPOINTS.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall collect data on—

(1) the number of permanent and temporary checkpoints utilized by officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(2) the location of each such checkpoint; and

(3) a description of each such checkpoint, including the presence of any other law enforcement agencies and the use of law enforcement resources such as canines.

(e) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with stakeholders, including research, civil and human rights organizations, shall issue regulations for the collection and reporting of data required under subsections (c) and (d) that—

(1) specify all data to be reported; and

(2) provide standards, definitions, and technical specifications to ensure uniform reporting.

(f) COMPILATION OF DATA.—

(1) DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall compile—

(A) the data recorded under subsection (c) by officers of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and by officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(B) the data collected under subsection (d) by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

(C) an analysis of all incidents investigated by the Office of Inspector General or the Office of Professional Responsibility of U.S. Customs and Border Protection or of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to determine—

(i) whether the data required to be collected under this section were properly recorded; and

(ii) if such date were not properly recorded, what corrective measures were or will be taken.

(2) OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.—The head of each agency, department, or other entity that employs law enforcement officials other than officers referred to in paragraph (1) shall—

(A) compile the data recorded by such law enforcement officials pursuant to subsection (c); and

(B) submit the compiled data to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(g) USE OF DATA.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider the data compiled under subsection (f) in making policy and program decisions related to enforcement of border security.

(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date of the regulations issued pursuant to subsection (e), and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to Congress that summarizes all of the data compiled under subsection (f) during the previous year.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public, except for particular data if the Secretary—

(A) explicitly invokes an exemption under paragraphs (1) through (9) of section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) provides a written explanation for the exemption's applicability.

(3) PROTECTION OF PRIVACY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not disclose unique personal identifying information of persons stopped, searched, or subjected to a property seizure that was recorded or collected under this section. The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be available to the public to the extent the release of the date contained in the report is permissible under Federal law.

SA 2020. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. IMMIGRANT ENTREPRENEURS.

(a) QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS.—

(1) ADMISSION AS IMMIGRANTS.—Chapter 1 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 210A. QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS.

''(a) ADMISSION AS IMMIGRANTS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in accordance with the provisions of this section and of section 216A, may issue a conditional immigrant visa to not more than 75,000 qualified alien entrepreneurs.

''(b) APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Every alien applying for a conditional immigrant visa under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Homeland Security in such form and manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

''(c) REVOCATION.—If, during the 4-year period beginning on the date on which an alien is granted a visa under this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that such alien is no longer a qualified alien entrepreneur, the Secretary shall—

''(1) revoke such visa; and

''(2) notify the alien that the alien—

''(A) may voluntarily depart from the United States in accordance to section 240B; or

''(B) will be subject to removal proceedings under section 240 if the alien does not depart from the United States not later than 6 months after receiving notification under this paragraph.

''(d) REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall remove the conditional basis of the status of an alien issued an immigrant visa under this section on that date that is 4 years after the date on which such visa was issued if such visa was not revoked pursuant to subsection (c).

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.—The term 'full-time employee' means a United States citizen or legal permanent resident who is paid by the new business entity registered by a qualified alien entrepreneur at a rate that is comparable to the median income of employees in the region.

''(2) QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEUR.—The term 'qualified alien entrepreneur' means an alien who—

''(A) at the time the alien applies for an immigrant visa under this section—

''(i) is lawfully present in the United States; and

''(ii)(I) holds a nonimmigrant visa pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b); or

''(II) holds a nonimmigrant visa pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(F)(i);

''(B) during the 1-year period beginning on the date the alien is granted a visa under this section—

''(i) registers at least 1 new business entity in a State;

''(ii) employs, at such business entity in the United States, at least 2 full-time employees who are not relatives of the alien; and

''(iii) invests, or raises capital investment of, not less than $100,000 in such business entity; and

''(C) during the 3-year period beginning on the last day of the 1-year period described in paragraph (2), employs, at such business entity in the United States, an average of at least 5 full-time employees who are not relatives of the alien.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 210 the following:

''Sec. 210A. Qualified alien entrepreneurs.''.

(b) CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Section 216A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186b) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Attorney General'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(C), by striking ''203(b)(5),'' and inserting ''203(b)(5) or 210A, as appropriate,'';

(3) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''alien entrepreneur must'' each place such term appears and inserting ''alien entrepreneur shall'';

(4) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''or 210A, as appropriate.''; and

(5) in subsection (f)(1), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''or 210A.''.

(c) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress regarding the qualified alien entrepreneurs granted immigrant status under section 210A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report described in paragraph (1) shall include information regarding—

(A) the number of qualified alien entrepreneurs who have received immigrant status under section 210A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a), listed by country of origin;

(B) the localities in which such qualified alien entrepreneurs have initially settled;

(C) whether such qualified alien entrepreneurs generally remain in the localities in which they initially settle;

(D) the types of commercial enterprises that such qualified alien entrepreneurs have established; and

(E) the types and number of jobs created by such qualified alien entrepreneurs.

SA 2021. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR IMMIGRANTS WITH AN ADVANCED DEGREE IN A STEM FIELD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1181 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 216A the following:

"SEC. 216B. CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ALIENS WITH AN ADVANCED DEGREE IN A STEM FIELD.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security may adjust the status of not more than 50,000 aliens who have earned a master's degree or a doctorate degree at an institution of higher education in a STEM field to that of an alien conditionally admitted for permanent residence and authorize each alien granted such adjustment of status to remain in the United States—

''(1) for up to 1 year after the expiration of the alien's student visa under section 101(a)(15)(F)(i) if the alien is diligently searching for an opportunity to become actively engaged in a STEM field; and

''(2) indefinitely if the alien remains actively engaged in a STEM field.

''(b) APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Every alien applying for a conditional permanent resident status under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Homeland Security before the expiration of the alien's student visa in such form and manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

''(c) INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE.—An alien granted conditional permanent resident status under this section shall not be eligible, while in such status, for—

''(1) any unemployment compensation (as defined in section 85(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); or

''(2) any Federal means-tested public benefit (as that term is used in section 403 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613)).

''(d) EFFECT ON NATURALIZATION RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.—An alien granted conditional permanent resident status under this section shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence for purposes of meeting the 5-year residency requirement under section 316(a)(1).

''(e) REMOVAL OF CONDITION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall remove the conditional basis of an alien's conditional permanent resident status under this section on the date that is 5 years after the date such status was granted if the alien maintained his or her eligibility for such status during the entire 5-year period.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN A STEM FIELD.—The term 'actively engaged in a STEM field'—

''(A) means—

''(i) gainfully employed in a for-profit business or nonprofit organization in the United States in a STEM field;

''(ii) teaching 1 or more STEM field courses at an institution of higher education; or

''(iii) employed by a Federal, State, or local government entity; and

''(B) includes any period of up to 6 months during which the alien does not meet the requirement under subparagraph (A) if such period was immediately preceded by a 1-year period during which the alien met the requirement under subparagraph (A).

''(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

''(3) STEM FIELD.—The term 'STEM field' means any field of study or occupation included on the most recent STEM-Designated Degree Program List published in the Federal Register by the Department of Homeland Security (as described in section 214.2(f)(11)(i)(C)(2) of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 216A the following:

''Sec. 216B. Conditional permanent resident status for aliens with an advanced degree in a STEM field.''.

(c) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress regarding the alien college graduates granted immigrant status under section 216B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include, with respect to the aliens described in such paragraph—

(A) the number who have earned a master's degree, broken down by the number of such degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(B) the number who have earned a doctorate degree, broken down by the number of such degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(C) the number who have founded a business in the United States in a STEM field;

(D) the number who are employed in the United States in a STEM field, broken down by employment sector (for profit, nonprofit, or government); and

(E) the number who are employed by an institution of higher education.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—The terms ''institution of higher education'' and ''STEM field'' have the meaning given such terms in section 216B(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a).

SA 2022. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. MODIFICATION OF PER COUNTRY NUMERICAL LIMITATION FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED VISAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''AND EMPLOYMENT-BASED'';

(2) by striking ''(3), (4), and (5),'' and inserting ''(3) and (4),'';

(3) by striking ''subsections (a) and (b) of section 203'' and inserting ''section 203(a)'';

(4) by striking ''7'' and inserting ''15''; and

(5) by striking ''such subsections'' and inserting ''such section''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''both subsections (a) and (b) of section 203'' and inserting ''section 203(a)''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (5); and

(2) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR COUNTRIES AT CEILING.—If the total number of immigrant visas made available under section 203(a) to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area will exceed the numerical limitation specified in subsection (a)(2) in any fiscal year, in determining the allotment of immigrant visa numbers to natives under section 203(a), visa numbers with respect to natives of that state or area shall be allocated (to the extent practicable and otherwise consistent with this section and section 203) in a manner so that, except as provided in subsection (a)(4), the proportion of the visa numbers made available under each of paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 203(a) is equal to the ratio of the total number of visas made available under the respective paragraph to the total number of visas made available under section 203(a).''.

(c) COUNTRY-SPECIFIC OFFSET.—Section 2 of the Chinese Student Protection Act of 1992 (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''subsection (e))'' and inserting ''subsection (d))''; and

(2) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on September 30, 2018, and shall apply to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2019.

(e) TRANSITION RULES FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to of this subsection and notwithstanding title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.), the following rules shall apply:

(A) For fiscal year 2019, 15 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the 2 states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2017 under such paragraphs.

(B) For fiscal year 2020, 10 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of such paragraphs shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the 2 states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2018 under such paragraphs.

(C) For fiscal year 2021, 10 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of such paragraphs shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the 2 states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2019 under such paragraphs.

(2) PER-COUNTRY LEVELS.—

(A) RESERVED VISAS.—With respect to the visas reserved under each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the number of such visas made available to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area in the appropriate fiscal year may not exceed 25 percent (in the case of a single foreign state) or 2 percent (in the case of a dependent area) of the total number of such visas.

(B) UNRESERVED VISAS.—With respect to the immigrant visas made available under each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) and not reserved under paragraph (1), for each of fiscal years 2019, 2020, and 2021, not more than 85 percent shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of any single foreign state.

(3) SPECIAL RULE TO PREVENT UNUSED VISAS.—If, with respect to fiscal year 2019, 2020, or 2021, the operation of paragraphs (1) and (2) would prevent the total number of immigrant visas made available under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 203(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) from being issued, such visas may be issued during the remainder of such fiscal year without regard to such paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) RULES FOR CHARGEABILITY.—Section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(b)) shall apply in determining the foreign state to which an alien is chargeable for purposes of this subsection.

SA 2023. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. RESCISSION OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 13768.

The provisions of Executive Order 13768 (82 Fed. Reg. 8799; January 25, 2017), entitled ''Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States'', are rescinded and shall not have any legal effect.

SA 2024. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION SUBMITTED FOR TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) TPS PROGRAM.—The term ''TPS Program'' means temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a).

(2) INDIVIDUAL APPLICATION INFORMATION.—The term ''individual application information'' means any information, including personally identifiable information, submitted to the Secretary as part of a request for consideration or reconsideration for the TPS Program.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(b) PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall protect individual application information from disclosure to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement or U.S. Customs and Border Protection for any purpose other than implementing the TPS Program.

(c) REFERRALS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary may not refer any individual who previously held Temporary Protected Status under the TPS Program to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the Department of Justice, or any other law enforcement agency.

(d) LIMITED EXCEPTION.—Individual application information may be shared with national security and law enforcement agencies—

(1) to identify or prevent fraudulent claims;

(2) for particularized national security purposes relating to an individual application; or

(3) for the investigation or prosecution of any felony not related to immigration status.

SA 2025. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. ENFORCEMENT AGAINST DACA RECIPIENTS PROHIBITED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of Homeland Security (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') shall not return, remove, or detain an alien who meets the requirements for deferred action status described in the memorandum of the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled ''Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children'' and dated June 15, 2012, or the requirements for such status described in the memorandum of the Secretary entitled ''Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Inidividuals Who Came to the United States as Children and with Respect to Certain Individuals Who Are the Parents of U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents'' and dated November 20, 2014 (referred to in this section as ''DACA status''), including an alien whose DACA status has expired.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may carry out return, removal, or detention activity with respect to an alien described in subsection (a)—

(1) for a particularized national security purpose relating to the alien; or

(2) if the alien has been convicted of a felony (except an offense relating to the immigration status of the alien).

(c) EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall not decline to adjudicate, delay adjudication of, or deny employment authorization to an alien described in subsection (a).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an alien described in subsection (b).

SA 2026. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC RESOURCES TO UNITED STATES CITIZEN CHILDREN BORN TO IMMIGRANT PARENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) 88 percent of children with immigrant parents were born in the United States and are United States citizens.

(2) Children with at least one immigrant parent account for 26 percent of all children in the United States.

(3) 9,100,000 children with immigrant parents live in low-income families.

(4) Federally funded programs, including Head Start and the Children's Health Insurance Program, are critical in delivering quality health care and comprehensive early childhood education, health, and nutrition to children from low-income families.

(5) State and local governments have made their own determinations with respect to what State and local resources immigrant families can utilize.

(6) The Trump Administration has written a draft rule regarding the definition of ''public charge'' that would limit the ability of United States citizen children to access public resources without threatening the immigration status of their family members.

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

(1) United States citizen children born to immigrant parents should be entitled to the same access to public resources as children born to United States citizen parents; and

(2) any attempt to limit the access of United States citizens to public benefits and resources based on the immigration status of their parents would be discriminatory and create second-class citizens.

SA 2027. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON DETAINED AND DEPORTED DACA RECIPIENTS.

(a) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term ''DACA status'' means the status granted to an alien who has been granted deferred action for childhood arrivals in accordance with the memorandum issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security on June 15, 2012.

(b) WEEKLY REPORT.—Not less frequently than weekly, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and post on a public website, a report that identifies—

(1) the number of individuals apprehended, detained, or arrested by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement or U.S. Customs and Border Protection during the reporting period who have ever been granted DACA status;

(2) the number of individuals removed by immigration officials during the reporting period who have ever been granted DACA status;

(3) the location of apprehension, detainment, or arrest of such individuals; and

(4) the reason for the apprehension, detainment, or arrest, including whether it was the result of targeted enforcement or a collateral arrest.

SA 2028. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BIRTHRIGHT CITIZENSHIP.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States states, ''All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.''.

(2) Since the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, the United States has been engaged in a long struggle to live up to its promise: that all people are equal under law.

(3) As a national community, the people of the United States have to confront the hard truth that the United States sometimes fall short of that idea, and that the United States has not always kept that promise.

(4) Though the United States has been humbled by past failures, the Nation's character will be measured by the strength of its continually renewed commitment to the fundamental national values of equality and dignity before the law.

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

(1) it would be a gross violation of the spirit of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to the national values of the United States for this or any future Congress to adopt any interpretation that some individuals who are born on United States soil are less deserving than others of the privileges of United States citizenship and the equal protection of the laws of the United States;

(2) the United States must protect, preserve, and honor the longstanding legal principle of birthright citizenship;

(3) the tradition of birthright citizenship is rooted in the ancient international legal principle of jus soli; and

(4) honoring citizenship by birth reflects the heritage of the United States as a country of immigrants, who choose to adopt the United States as their homeland, and whose diverse cultures and experiences are woven into the tapestry of the Nation's history.

SA 2029. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. TRADE FACILITATION AND SECURITY ENHANCEMENT.

(a) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term ''designated port of entry'' means any land port of entry on the Southern border that has—

(1) expanded growth in cross-border traffic;

(2) engaged in binational innovative pilot programs; and

(3) relied on private-public partnership agreements for added staffing or extended hours.

(b) PRIVATE VEHICLES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall facilitate the safe, secure, and efficient cross border movement of people, motor vehicles, cargo, and lawful and legitimate trade travel by extending the hours of operation to 24 hours per day for private vehicles at designated ports of entry.

(c) COMMERCIAL VEHICLES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall facilitate the safe, secure, and efficient cross border movement of people, motor vehicles, cargo, and lawful and legitimate trade travel by ensuring that commercial vehicles may cross through designated ports of entry—

(1) anytime between 6:00 am and midnight, Monday through Friday; and

(2) anytime between 8:00 am and 4:00 pm on Saturday.

(d) RESOURCES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that sufficient resources are dedicated to designated ports of entry—

(1) to carry out the functions of commercial operations, including accepting entries of merchandise, collecting duties, and enforcing the customs, immigration, and trade laws of the United States; and

(2) to perform the functions described in paragraph (1) during the hours set forth in subsection (c) beginning not later than the date set forth in subsection (c).

(e) COORDINATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall coordinate with the appropriate officials of the Government of Mexico to implement this section.

SA 2030. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1958 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. KING, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COONS, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 4(c) of the amendment, strike paragraphs (2) and (3) and insert the following:

(2) For domain awareness, $658,000,000, including $147,700,000 for border surveillance technology, as follows:

(A) $46,200,000 for Remote Video Surveillance System (RVSS).

(B) $1,600,000 for Mobile Video Surveillance System (MVSS).

(C) $2,500,000 for Small Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS).

(D) $16,200,000 for Motion Sensor Capability (MSC).

(E) $17,400,000 for Integrated Fixed Towers (IFT) to the Tucson Sector.

(F) $34,800,000 for tactical aerostats.

(G) $9,000,000 for Cross-border tunnel technology (CBTT).

(H) $20,000,000 for Unattended Ground Sensors (UGS).

(3) For access and mobility, $143,000,000, including $172,900,000 for Air & Marine Operations assets, as follows:

(A) $55,500,000 for Multi-Enforcement Aircraft (MEA).

(B) $11,000,000 for MEA-Based Vehicle And Dismount Exploitation Radar (VADER).

(C) $14,000,000 for UH–60 helicopter conversion.

(D) $7,800,000 for Aircraft Sensor Upgrades (EO/IR).

(E) $41,200,000 for Tethered Aerostat (TARS) and explore PTDS (Persistent Threat Detection Systems) to improve situational awareness.

(F) $43,400,000 for Light Enforcement Helicopters (LEH).

SA 2031. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION B—SECURING THE NORTHERN TRIANGLE

SEC. 10001. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''Secure the Northern Triangle Act''.

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

DIVISION B—SECURING THE NORTHERN TRIANGLE

Sec. 10001. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 10002. Findings.
Sec. 10003. Sense of Congress.
Sec. 10004. Definitions.

TITLE XI—ADVANCING REFORMS IN CENTRAL AMERICA TO ADDRESS THE FACTORS DRIVING MIGRATION

Subtitle A—Strengthening the Capacity of Central American Governments To Protect and Provide for Their Own People

Sec. 10111. Authorization of appropriations for United States strategy for engagement in Central America.
Sec. 10112. Strengthening the rule of law and combating corruption.
Sec. 10113. Combating criminal violence and improving citizen security.
Sec. 10114. Tackling extreme poverty and advancing economic development.

Subtitle B—Conditions, Limitations, and Certifications on United States Assistance

Sec. 10121. Assistance funding available without condition.
Sec. 10122. Conditions on assistance related to smuggling, screening, and safety of migrants.
Sec. 10123. Conditions on assistance related to progress on specific issues.

Subtitle C—Effectively Coordinating United States Engagement in Central America

Sec. 10131. United States Coordinator for Engagement in Central America.

Subtitle D—United States Leadership for Engaging International Donors and Partners

Sec. 10141. Requirement for strategy to secure support of international donors and partners.

TITLE XII—CRACKING DOWN ON SMUGGLERS, CARTELS, AND TRAFFICKERS EXPLOITING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Subtitle A—Strengthening Cooperation Among Law Enforcement Agencies To Target Smugglers and Traffickers

Sec. 10211. Enhanced international cooperation to combat human smuggling and trafficking.
Sec. 10212. Enhanced investigation and prosecution of human smuggling and trafficking.
Sec. 10213. Information campaign on dangers of migration.

Subtitle B—Strengthening the Ability of the United States Government To Crack Down on Smugglers, Traffickers, and Drug Cartels

Sec. 10221. Enhanced penalties for organized smuggling schemes.
Sec. 10222. Expanding financial sanctions on narcotics trafficking and money laundering.

Subtitle C—Creating New Penalties for Hindering Immigration, Border, and Customs Controls

Sec. 10231. Hindering immigration, border, and customs controls.

TITLE XIII—MINIMIZING BORDER CROSSINGS BY EXPANDING PROCESSING OF REFUGEE CHILDREN AND FAMILIES IN-COUNTRY AND IN THE REGION

Subtitle A—Providing Alternative Safe Havens in Mexico and the Region

Sec. 10311. Strengthening internal asylum systems in Mexico and other countries.

Subtitle B—Expanding Refugee Processing in Mexico and Central America for Third Country Resettlement

Sec. 10321. Expanding refugee processing in Mexico and Central America for third country resettlement.

Subtitle C—Improving the Efficiency of the Central American Minors Program

Sec. 10331. Expansion.
Sec. 10332. Expedited processing.
Sec. 10333. Referral to UNHCR.

TITLE XIV—MONITORING AND SUPPORTING UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN AFTER PROCESSING AT THE BORDER

Sec. 10401. Definitions; authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle A—Strengthening the Government's Ability To Oversee the Safety and Well-Being of Children

Sec. 10411. Background checks to ensure the safe placement of unaccompanied alien children.
Sec. 10412. Responsibility of sponsor for immigration court compliance and child well-being.
Sec. 10413. Monitoring unaccompanied alien children.

Subtitle B—Funding to States and School Districts; Supporting Education and Safety

Sec. 10421. Funding to States to conduct State criminal checks and child abuse and neglect checks.
Sec. 10422. Funding to school districts for unaccompanied alien children.
Sec. 10423. Immediate enrollment of unaccompanied alien children in schools.

TITLE XV—ENSURING ORDERLY AND HUMANE MANAGEMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SEEKING PROTECTION

Subtitle A—Providing a Fair and Efficient Legal Process for Children and Vulnerable Families Seeking Asylum

Sec. 10511. Court appearance compliance and legal orientation.
Sec. 10512. Fair day in court for kids.

Subtitle B—Reducing Significant Delays in Immigration Court

Sec. 10521. Eliminate immigration court backlogs.
Sec. 10522. Improved training for immigration judges and members of the Board of Immigration Appeals.
Sec. 10523. New technology to improve court efficiency.

Subtitle C—Reducing the Likelihood of Remigration

Sec. 10531. Establishing reintegration and monitoring services for repatriating children.

SEC. 10002. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since 2006, incidents of murder, other violent crime, and corruption perpetrated by armed criminal gangs and illicit trafficking organizations have risen alarmingly in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras (referred

to in this division as the ''Northern Triangle'').

(2) In 2013, Honduras had the highest per capita homicide rate of any nation in the world, with 90.4 murders for every 100,000 people in the country. El Salvador and Guatemala were in the top 5 countries with the highest per capita homicide rates.

(3) Since 2013, El Salvador's murder rate rose sharply to become the highest of any country in the world in 2015 at 108.5 homicides for every 100,000 people, following a dramatic escalation of violence between the country's 2 largest armed criminal gangs, Mara Salvatrucha (commonly known as ''MS–13'') and Barrio 18.

(4) According to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), the per capita homicide rate for children in El Salvador and Guatemala is higher than any other country in the world. In 2014, 27 out of every 100,000 children were murdered in El Salvador.

(5) According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Honduras and El Salvador have the highest per capita female homicide rates in the world. In 2014, 90 out of every 100,000 females were murdered in Honduras.

(6) In April 2016, UNHCR's spokesperson stated, ''The number of people fleeing violence in Central America has surged to levels not seen since the region was wracked by armed conflicts in the 1980s. Action is urgently needed to ensure that unaccompanied children and others receive the protection to which they are entitled.''.

(7) Since 2013, individuals fleeing the Northern Triangle have sought sanctuary in neighboring countries and there has recently been a 1,185 percent increase in the number of asylum applications from citizens of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras to the Governments of Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Belize.

(8) Unaccompanied minors from the Northern Triangle now make up the majority of unaccompanied minors encountered at the international border between the United States and Mexico, with the fastest increase occurring among children younger than 12 years of age.

(9) Human smugglers are increasingly responsible for the transit of migrants from the Northern Triangle to the United States. According to the Government Accountability Office, human smugglers frequently use aggressive and misleading marketing to recruit migrants.

(10) Many female migrants face rape and sexual violence during the journey, either from smugglers or others encountered on the route, or risk being trafficked for sex or labor.

(11) Challenges to the rule of law in the Northern Triangle have been exacerbated by the limited ability and lack of political will on the part of governments to investigate and prosecute those responsible for murder. In 2014, approximately 95 percent of murders remained unresolved in Honduras and El Salvador.

(12) The presence of major drug trafficking organizations in the Northern Triangle contributes to violence, corruption, and criminality. The 2016 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report prepared by the Department of State estimated that ''approximately 90 percent of the cocaine trafficked to the United States in the first half of 2015 first transited through the Mexico/Central America corridor''.

(13) Widespread public sector corruption in the Northern Triangle undermines economic and social development and directly affects regional political stability, as demonstrated by the indictment and resignation of former Guatemalan president Otto Perez Molina on corruption charges.

(14) Human rights defenders, journalists, trade unionists, social leaders, and LGBT activists in the Northern Triangle face dire conditions, as evidenced by the March 2016 murder of Honduran activist Berta Cáceres and the targeted killing of more than 200 such civil society leaders since 2006. Almost none of these cases have resulted in convictions.

(15) The Northern Triangle struggles with high levels of economic insecurity. In 2014, more than 62 percent of Hondurans, more than 59 percent of Guatemalans, and more than 31 percent of Salvadorans lived below the poverty line.

(16) Weak investment climates and low levels of educational opportunity are barriers to inclusive economic growth and social development in the Northern Triangle.

(17) Although the CAM Program has approval rates of nearly 98 percent, due to limited resources, of the 8,920 children that have applied for humanitarian protection, only 626 have been conditionally approved and only 368 have entered the United States.

(18) Approximately 50 percent of unaccompanied minors facing United States immigration proceedings receive legal representation. Children with legal counsel appeared at their hearings more than 95 percent of the time.

(19) As of May 2016, 492,978 cases were pending before immigration courts, with such cases taking an average of 553 days to reach a final decision.

SEC. 10003. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States must address the violence and humanitarian crisis resulting in the elevated numbers of unaccompanied children, women, and refugees from the Northern Triangle arriving at the Southwestern border of the United States;

(2) the violence and humanitarian crisis has been prompted by the severe challenges posed by—

(A) high rates of homicide, sexual violence, and violent crime perpetrated by armed criminal actors;

(B) endemic corruption; and

(C) the limited ability and the lack of political will on the part of governments to protect their citizens and uphold the rule of law in the Northern Triangle;

(3) the United States must work with international partners—

(A) to address the complicated conditions in the Northern Triangle that contribute to the violence and humanitarian crisis; and

(B) to protect vulnerable populations, particularly women and children, fleeing violence in the region;

(4) the Plan of the Alliance for Prosperity in the Northern Triangle, which was developed by the Governments of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, with the technical assistance of the Inter-American Development Bank, represents a comprehensive approach to address the complex situation in the Northern Triangle;

(5) the U.S. Strategy for Engagement in Central America, as articulated by President Obama and Vice President Biden, provides important support for the Alliance for Prosperity and other United States national security priorities, including rule of law and anti-corruption initiatives;

(6) combating corruption in the Northern Triangle must remain a critical priority and the United Nation's Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala (CICIG) and the Organization of American States' Mission to Support the Fight Against Corruption and Impunity in Honduras (MACCIH) are important contributions to this effort;

(7) the CAM Program provides a safe, legal, and orderly alternative to children fleeing violence in the Northern Triangle;

(8) the United States must—

(A) expand the CAM Program to ensure the safe and orderly processing of refugee children in the region;

(B) strengthen internal asylum systems in Mexico and other countries in the region to protect and process eligible children and families, including establishing and expanding in-country reception centers;

(C) expand access to legal representation for unaccompanied alien children facing United States immigration proceedings; and

(D) reduce delays in immigration courts, which contribute to misinformation that migrants who come to the United States will not be removed; and

(9) it is imperative for the United States to sustain a long-term commitment to addressing the factors causing Central Americans to flee their countries by strengthening citizen security, the rule of law, democratic governance, the protection of human rights, and inclusive economic growth in the Northern Triangle.

SEC. 10004. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) CAM PROGRAM.—The term ''CAM Program'' means the Central American Minors Refugee/Parole Program administered by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

(2) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ''intelligence community'' has the meaning given the term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

(3) NORTHERN TRIANGLE.—The term ''Northern Triangle'' means El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

(4) PLACEMENT.—The term ''placement'' means the placement of an unaccompanied alien child with a sponsor.

(5) PLAN.—The term ''Plan'' means the Plan of the Alliance for Prosperity in the Northern Triangle.

(6) SPONSOR.—The term ''sponsor'' means a sponsor referred to in section 462(b)(4) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(b)(4)).

(7) UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILD.—The term ''unaccompanied alien child'' has the meaning given the term in section 462(g) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)).

TITLE XI—ADVANCING REFORMS IN CENTRAL AMERICA TO ADDRESS THE FACTORS DRIVING MIGRATION

Subtitle A—Strengthening the Capacity of Central American Governments To Protect and Provide for Their Own People

SEC. 10111. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNITED STATES STRATEGY FOR ENGAGEMENT IN CENTRAL AMERICA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated $1,040,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 to carry out the United States Strategy for Engagement in Central America, as defined by the objectives set forth in subsection (b). Amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) may be made available for assistance to Central American countries to implement the United States Strategy for Engagement in Central America in support of the Plan, including efforts—

(1) to strengthen the rule of law and bolster the effectiveness of judicial systems, public prosecutors' offices, and civilian police forces;

(2) to combat corruption and improve public sector transparency;

(3) to confront and counter the violence and crime perpetrated by armed criminal

gangs, illicit trafficking organizations, and organized crime;

(4) to disrupt money laundering operations and the illicit financial networks of armed criminal gangs, illicit trafficking organizations, and human smugglers;

(5) to strengthen democratic governance and promote greater respect for internationally recognized human rights, labor rights, fundamental freedoms, and the media;

(6) to enhance the capability of Central American governments to protect and provide for vulnerable and at-risk populations;

(7) to address the underlying causes of poverty and inequality; and

(8) to address the constraints to inclusive economic growth in Central America.

(c) PRIORITIZATION.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall prioritize the provision of assistance authorized under this section to address the key factors in Central American countries that contribute to the flight of unaccompanied alien children and other individuals to the United States.

SEC. 10112. STRENGTHENING THE RULE OF LAW AND COMBATING CORRUPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10111(a), $260,000,000 may be made available to the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to strengthen the rule of law, combat corruption, consolidate democratic governance, and defend human rights.

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR CENTRAL AMERICA.—The Secretary and the Administrator may use the amounts made available under subsection (a) to provide assistance for Central American countries through the activities described in subsection (c).

(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Activities described in this section include—

(1) strengthening the rule of law in Central American countries by providing support for—

(A) the Office of the Attorney General and public prosecutors in each such country, including the enhancement of their forensics and communications interception capabilities;

(B) reforms leading to independent, merit-based, selection processes for judges and prosecutors, and relevant ethics and professional training;

(C) the improvement of victim and witness protection; and

(D) the reform and improvement of prison facilities and management;

(2) combating corruption by providing support for—

(A) inspectors general and oversight institutions, including relevant training for inspectors and auditors;

(B) international commissions against impunity, including the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala (CICIG) and the Support Mission Against Corruption and Impunity in Honduras (MACCIH);

(C) civil society watchdogs conducting oversight of executive branch officials and functions, police and security forces, and judicial officials and public prosecutors; and

(D) the enhancement of freedom of information mechanisms;

(3) consolidating democratic governance by providing support for—

(A) the reform of civil services, related training programs, and relevant career laws and processes that lead to independent, merit-based selection processes;

(B) national legislatures and their capacity to conduct oversight of executive branch functions;

(C) the reform of political party and campaign finance laws; and

(D) local governments and their capacity to provide critical safety, education, health, and sanitation services to citizens; and

(4) defending human rights by providing support for—

(A) human rights ombudsman offices;

(B) government protection programs that provide physical protection to human rights defenders, journalists, trade unionists, and civil society activists at risk;

(C) civil society organizations that promote and defend human rights, freedom of expression, freedom of the press, labor rights, and LGBT rights; and

(D) civil society organizations that address sexual, domestic, and inter-partner violence against women and protect victims of such violence.

SEC. 10113. COMBATING CRIMINAL VIOLENCE AND IMPROVING CITIZEN SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10111(a), $260,000,000 may be made available to the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to counter the violence and crime perpetrated by armed criminal gangs, illicit trafficking organizations and human smugglers.

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR CENTRAL AMERICA.—The Secretary and the Administrator may use the amounts made available under subsection (a) to provide assistance for Central American countries through the activities described in subsection (c).

(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Activities described in this section include—

(1) professionalizing civilian police forces by providing support for—

(A) the reform of personnel vetting and dismissal processes, including the enhancement of polygraph capability for use in such processes;

(B) inspectors general and oversight offices, including relevant training for inspectors and auditors;

(C) community policing policies and programs;

(D) the establishment of special vetted units;

(E) training on the appropriate use of force and human rights;

(F) training on civilian intelligence collection, investigative techniques, forensic analysis, and evidence preservation; and

(G) equipment, such as nonintrusive inspection equipment and communications interception technology;

(2) countering illicit trafficking by providing assistance to the civilian law enforcement and armed forces of Central American countries, including support for—

(A) the establishment of special vetted units;

(B) the enhancement of intelligence collection capacity;

(C) the reform of personnel vetting and dismissal processes, including the enhancement of polygraph capability for use in such processes; and

(D) port, airport, and border security equipment, including—

(i) computer infrastructure and data management systems;

(ii) secure communications technologies;

(iii) communications interception technology;

(iv) nonintrusive inspection equipment; and

(v) radar and aerial surveillance equipment;

(3) disrupting illicit financial networks by providing support for—

(A) finance ministries, including the enhancement of the capacity to use financial sanctions to block the assets of individuals and organizations involved in money laundering and the financing of armed criminal gangs, illicit trafficking networks, human smugglers, and organized crime;

(B) financial intelligence units, including the establishment and enhancement of anti-money laundering programs; and

(C) the reform of bank secrecy laws; and

(4) improving crime prevention by providing support for—

(A) programs that address domestic violence and violence against women;

(B) the enhancement of programs for at-risk and criminal-involved youth, including the improvement of community centers; and

(C) alternative livelihood programs.

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

(1) operational technology transferred to governments in Central America for intelligence or law enforcement purposes should be used solely for the purposes for which the technology was intended; and

(2) the United States should take all necessary steps to ensure that the use of operation technology described in paragraph (1) is consistent with United States law, including protections of freedom of expression, freedom of movement, and freedom of association.

SEC. 10114. TACKLING EXTREME POVERTY AND ADVANCING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10111(a), $230,000,000 may be made available to the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development—

(1) to address the underlying causes of poverty and inequality; and

(2) to improve economic development.

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR CENTRAL AMERICA.—The Secretary and the Administrator may use the amounts made available under subsection (a) to provide assistance for Central American countries through the activities described in subsection (c).

(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Activities described in this section include—

(1) strengthening human capital by providing support for—

(A) workforce development and entrepreneurship training programs that are driven by market demand, specifically programs that prioritize women, at-risk youth, and minorities;

(B) improving early-grade literacy and the improvement of primary and secondary school curricula;

(C) relevant professional training for teachers and educational administrators; and

(D) educational policy reform and improvement of education sector budgeting;

(2) enhancing economic competitiveness and investment climate by providing support for—

(A) small business development centers and programs that strengthen supply chain integration;

(B) trade facilitation and customs harmonization programs;

(C) reducing energy costs through investments in clean technologies and the reform of energy policies and regulations;

(D) the improvement of protections for investors, including dispute resolution and arbitration mechanisms; and

(E) the improvement of labor and environmental standards, in accordance with the Dominican Republic–Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA–DR);

(3) strengthening food security by providing support for—

(A) small-scale agriculture, including technical training and programs that facilitate access to credit;

(B) agricultural value chain development for farming communities;

(C) nutrition programs to reduce childhood stunting rates; and

(D) investment in scientific research on climate change and climate resiliency; and

(4) improving the state of fiscal and financial affairs by providing support for—

(A) domestic revenue generation, including programs to improve tax administration, collection, and enforcement;

(B) strengthening public sector financial management, including strategic budgeting and expenditure tracking; and

(C) reform of customs and procurement policies and processes.

Subtitle B—Conditions, Limitations, and Certifications on United States Assistance

SEC. 10121. ASSISTANCE FUNDING AVAILABLE WITHOUT CONDITION.

The Secretary of State may obligate up to 25 percent of the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10111(a) to carry out the United States Strategy for Engagement in Central America in support of the Plan.

SEC. 10122. CONDITIONS ON ASSISTANCE RELATED TO SMUGGLING, SCREENING, AND SAFETY OF MIGRANTS.

(a) NOTIFICATION AND COOPERATION.—In addition to the amounts authorized to be obligated under sections 10121 and 10123, the Secretary of State may obligate an additional 25 percent of the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10111(a) for assistance to the Government of El Salvador, the Government of Guatemala, and the Government of Honduras after the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, certifies and reports to Congress that such governments are taking effective steps, in addition to steps taken during previous years, to—

(1) combat human smuggling and trafficking, including investigating, prosecuting, and increasing penalties for individuals responsible for such crimes;

(2) improve border security and border screening to detect and deter illicit smuggling and trafficking, while respecting the rights of individuals fleeing violence and seeking humanitarian protection asylum, in accordance with international law;

(3) cooperate with United States Government agencies and other governments in the region to facilitate the safe and timely repatriation of migrants who do not qualify for refugee or other protected status, in accordance with international law;

(4) improve reintegration services for repatriated migrants in a manner that ensures the safety and well-being of the individual and reduces the likelihood of remigration; and

(5) cooperate with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to improve protections for, and the processing of, vulnerable populations, particularly women and children fleeing violence.

SEC. 10123. CONDITIONS ON ASSISTANCE RELATED TO PROGRESS ON SPECIFIC ISSUES.

(a) EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION.—In addition to the amounts authorized to be obligated under sections 10121 and 10122, the Secretary of State may obligate an additional 50 percent of the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10111 for assistance to the Government of El Salvador, the Government of Guatemala, and the Government of Honduras after the Secretary consults with, and subsequently certifies and reports to, the appropriate congressional committees that such governments are taking effective steps in their respective countries, in addition to steps taken during the previous calendar year, to—

(1) establish an autonomous, publicly accountable entity to provide oversight of the Plan;

(2) combat corruption, including investigating and prosecuting government officials, military personnel, and civil police officers credibly alleged to be corrupt;

(3) implement reforms and strengthen the rule of law, including increasing the capacity and independence of the judiciary and public prosecutors;

(4) counter the activities of armed criminal gangs, illicit trafficking networks, and organized crime;

(5) establish and implement a plan to create a professional, accountable civilian police force and curtail the role of the military in internal policing;

(6) investigate and prosecute, through the civilian justice system, military and police personnel who are credibly alleged to have violated human rights, and to ensure that the military and the police are cooperating in such cases;

(7) cooperate with international commissions against impunity, as appropriate, and with regional human rights entities;

(8) implement reforms related to improving the transparency of financing political campaigns and political parties;

(9) protect the right of political opposition parties, journalists, trade unionists, human rights defenders, and other civil society activists to operate without interference;

(10) increase government revenues, including by enhancing tax collection, strengthening customs agencies, and reforming procurement processes;

(11) implement reforms to strengthen educational systems, vocational training programs, and programs for at-risk youth;

(12) resolve commercial disputes, including the confiscation of real property, between United States entities and the respective governments; and

(13) implement a policy by which local communities, civil society organizations (including indigenous and marginalized groups), and local governments are consulted in the design, implementation and evaluation of the activities of the Plan that affect such communities, organizations, or governments.

Subtitle C—Effectively Coordinating United States Engagement in Central America

SEC. 10131. UNITED STATES COORDINATOR FOR ENGAGEMENT IN CENTRAL AMERICA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall designate a senior official to coordinate all of the Federal Government's efforts and the efforts of international partners to strengthen citizen security, the rule of law, and economic prosperity in Central America and to protect vulnerable populations in the region.

(b) SUPERVISION.—The official designated under subsection (a) shall report directly to the President.

(c) DUTIES.—The official designated under subsection (a) shall coordinate all of the efforts, activities, and programs related to United States engagement in Central America, including—

(1) coordinating with the Department of State, the Department of Justice (including the Federal Bureau of Investigation), the Department of Homeland Security, the intelligence community, and international partners regarding United States efforts to confront armed criminal gangs, illicit trafficking networks, and organized crime responsible for high levels of violence, extortion, and corruption in Central America;

(2) coordinating with the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and international partners regarding United States efforts to prevent and mitigate the effects of violent criminal gangs and transnational criminal organizations on vulnerable Central American populations, including women and children;

(3) coordinating with the Department of State, the Department of Homeland Security, and international partners regarding United States efforts to counter human smugglers illegally transporting Central American migrants to the United States;

(4) coordinating with the Department of State, the Department of Homeland Security, the United States Agency for International Development, and international partners, including the United Nations High Commissions for Refugees, to increase protections for vulnerable Central American populations, improve refugee processing, and strengthen asylum systems throughout the region;

(5) coordinating with the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Justice (including the Drug Enforcement Administration), the Department of the Treasury, the intelligence community, and international partners regarding United States efforts to combat illicit narcotics traffickers, interdict transshipments of illicit narcotics, and disrupt the financing of the illicit narcotics trade;

(6) coordinating with the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Justice, the intelligence community, the United States Agency for International Development, and international partners regarding United States efforts to combat corruption, money laundering, and illicit financial networks;

(7) coordinating with the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the United States Agency for International Development, and international partners regarding United States efforts to strengthen the rule of law, democratic governance, and human rights protections; and

(8) coordinating with the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the United States Agency for International Development, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the United States Trade and Development Agency, the Department of Labor, and international partners, including the Inter-American Development Bank, to strengthen the foundation for inclusive economic growth and improve food security, investment climate, and protections for labor rights.

(d) CONSULTATION.—The official designated under subsection (a) shall consult with Congress, multilateral organizations and institutions, foreign governments, and domestic and international civil society organizations.

Subtitle D—United States Leadership for Engaging International Donors and Partners

SEC. 10141. REQUIREMENT FOR STRATEGY TO SECURE SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL DONORS AND PARTNERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a 3-year strategy to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) describes how the United States will secure support from international donors and regional partners (including Colombia and Mexico) for the implementation of the Plan;

(2) identifies governments that are willing to provide financial and technical assistance for the implementation of the Plan and a description of such assistance; and

(3) identifies the financial and technical assistance to be provided by multilateral institutions, including the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Andean Development Corporation—Development Bank of Latin America, and the Organization of

American States, and a description of such assistance.

(b) DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT AND COORDINATION.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, as appropriate, shall—

(1) carry out diplomatic engagement to secure contributions of financial and technical assistance from international donors and partners in support of the Plan; and

(2) take all necessary steps to ensure effective cooperation among international donors and partners supporting the Plan.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after submitting the strategy submitted under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes—

(1) the progress made in implementing the strategy; and

(2) the financial and technical assistance provided by international donors and partners, including the multilateral institutions listed in subsection (a)(3).

(d) BRIEFINGS.—Upon a request from one of the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of State shall provide a briefing to the committee that describes the progress made in implementing the strategy submitted under subsection (a).

(e) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

TITLE XII—CRACKING DOWN ON SMUGGLERS, CARTELS, AND TRAFFICKERS EXPLOITING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Subtitle A—Strengthening Cooperation Among Law Enforcement Agencies To Target Smugglers and Traffickers

SEC. 10211. ENHANCED INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION TO COMBAT HUMAN SMUGGLING AND TRAFFICKING.

(a) PARTNERSHIP EXPANSION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall expand partnership efforts with law enforcement entities in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico seeking to combat human smuggling and trafficking in those countries, including—

(1) the creation or expansion of transnational criminal investigative units to identify, disrupt, and prosecute human smuggling and trafficking operations;

(2) participation by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Department of Justice in the Bilateral Human Trafficking Enforcement Initiative with their Mexican law enforcement counterparts; and

(3) advanced training programs for investigators and prosecutors from El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out subsection (a).

SEC. 10212. ENHANCED INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF HUMAN SMUGGLING AND TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall expand collaborative programs aimed at investigating and prosecuting human smugglers and traffickers targeting Central American children and families and operating at the Southwestern border, including the continuation and expansion of anti-trafficking coordination teams.

(b) HOMELAND SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall increase the resources available to Homeland Security Investigations to facilitate the expansion of its smuggling and trafficking investigations.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 10213. INFORMATION CAMPAIGN ON DANGERS OF MIGRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall design and implement public information campaigns in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras—

(1) to disseminate information about the dangers of travel across Mexico to the United States; and

(2) to combat misinformation about United States immigration law or policy.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The information campaigns implemented pursuant to subsection (a) shall, to the greatest extent possible—

(1) be targeted at populations and localities with high migration rates;

(2) employ a variety of communications media; and

(3) be developed in consultation with program officials at the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State, or other government, nonprofit, or academic entities in close contact with migrant populations from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, including repatriated migrants.

Subtitle B—Strengthening the Ability of the United States Government To Crack Down on Smugglers, Traffickers, and Drug Cartels

SEC. 10221. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR ORGANIZED SMUGGLING SCHEMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 274(a)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively;

(2) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) in the case of a violation of subparagraph (A)(i) during and in relation to which the person, while acting for profit or other financial gain, knowingly directs or participates in an effort or scheme to assist or cause 10 or more persons (other than a parent, spouse, or child of the offender) to enter or to attempt to enter the United States at the same time at a place other than a designated port of entry or place other than designated by the Secretary, be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both;''; and

(3) in clause (iv), as redesignated, by inserting ''commits or attempts to commit sexual assault of,'' after ''section 1365 of title 18, United States Code) to,''.

(b) BULK CASH SMUGGLING.—Section 5332(b)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''TERM OF IMPRISONMENT'' and inserting ''IN GENERAL''; and

(2) by inserting '', fined under title 18, or both'' after ''5 years''.

SEC. 10222. EXPANDING FINANCIAL SANCTIONS ON NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND MONEY LAUNDERING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In July 2011, President Obama released ''Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime'', which articulates a multidimensional response to combat transnational organized crime, including drug trafficking networks, armed criminal gangs, and money laundering.

(2) The Strategy calls for expanded efforts to dismantle illicit financial networks, including through maximizing the use of the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Senate should immediately confirm pending nominations to key national security positions, including Mr. Adam Szubin, who was nominated by President Obama on April 16, 2015, to the position of Undersecretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes within the Department of the Treasury, a critical position focused on identifying and confronting illicit financial networks.

(c) FINANCIAL SANCTIONS EXPANSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of Central Intelligence shall expand investigations, intelligence collection, and analysis pursuant to the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act to increase the identification and application of sanctions against—

(A) significant foreign narcotics traffickers, their organizations and networks; and

(B) the foreign persons who provide material, financial, or technological support to such traffickers, organizations, and networks.

(2) TARGETS.—The efforts described in paragraph (1) shall specifically target foreign narcotics traffickers, their organizations and networks, and the foreign persons who provide material, financial, or technological support to such traffickers, organizations and networks that are present and operating in Central or South America.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out subsection (c).

Subtitle C—Creating New Penalties for Hindering Immigration, Border, and Customs Controls

SEC. 10231. HINDERING IMMIGRATION, BORDER, AND CUSTOMS CONTROLS.

(a) IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—The Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 274D the following:

''SEC. 274E. HINDERING IMMIGRATION, BORDER, AND CUSTOMS CONTROLS.

''(a) ILLICIT SPOTTING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful to knowingly surveil, track, monitor, or transmit the location, movement, or activities of any officer or employee of a Federal, State, or tribal law enforcement agency—

''(A) with the intent to gain financially; and

''(B) in furtherance of any violation of the immigration laws, the customs and trade laws of the United States (as defined in section 2 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–125)), any other Federal law relating to transporting controlled substances, agriculture, or monetary instruments into the United States, or any Federal law relating to border controls measures of the United States.

''(2) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) DESTRUCTION OF UNITED STATES BORDER CONTROLS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful to knowingly and without lawful authorization—

''(A) destroy or significantly damage any fence, barrier, sensor, camera, or other physical or electronic device deployed by the Federal Government to control an international border of, or a port of entry to, the United States; or

''(B) otherwise seek to construct, excavate, or make any structure intended to defeat, circumvent or evade such a fence, barrier, sensor camera, or other physical or electronic device deployed by the Federal Government to control an international border of, or a port of entry to, the United States.

''(2) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 274D the following:

''Sec. 274E. Hindering immigration, border, and customs controls.''.

TITLE XIII—MINIMIZING BORDER CROSSINGS BY EXPANDING PROCESSING OF REFUGEE CHILDREN AND FAMILIES IN-COUNTRY AND IN THE REGION

Subtitle A—Providing Alternative Safe Havens in Mexico and the Region

SEC. 10311. STRENGTHENING INTERNAL ASYLUM SYSTEMS IN MEXICO AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall work with international partners, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to support and provide technical assistance to strengthen the domestic capacity of Mexico and other countries in the region to provide asylum to eligible children and families by—

(1) establishing and expanding temporary and long-term in-country reception centers and shelter capacity to meet the humanitarian needs of those seeking asylum or other forms of international protection;

(2) improving the asylum registration system to ensure that all individuals seeking asylum or other humanitarian protection—

(A) are properly screened for security, including biographic and biometric capture;

(B) receive due process and meaningful access to existing legal protections; and

(C) receive proper documents in order to prevent fraud and ensure freedom of movement and access to basic social services;

(3) creating or expanding a corps of trained asylum officers capable of evaluating and deciding individual asylum claims consistent with international law and obligations; and

(4) developing the capacity to conduct best interest determinations for unaccompanied alien children to ensure that their needs are properly met, which may include family reunification or resettlement based on international protection needs.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit a report that describes the plans of the Secretary of State to assist in developing the asylum processing capabilities described in subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(5) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(6) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out subsection (a).

Subtitle B—Expanding Refugee Processing in Mexico and Central America for Third Country Resettlement

SEC. 10321. EXPANDING REFUGEE PROCESSING IN MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA FOR THIRD COUNTRY RESETTLEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall coordinate with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to support and provide technical assistance to the Government of Mexico and the governments of other countries in the region to increase access to global resettlement for eligible children and families with protection needs by—

(1) establishing and expanding in-country refugee reception centers to meet the humanitarian needs of those seeking international protection;

(2) improving the refugee registration system to ensure that all refugees—

(A) are properly screened for security, including biographic and biometric capture;

(B) receive due process and meaningful access to existing legal protections; and

(C) receive proper documents in order to prevent fraud and ensure freedom of movement and access to basic social services;

(3) creating or expanding a corps of trained refugee officers capable of evaluating and deciding individual claims for protection, consistent with international law and obligations; and

(4) developing the capacity to conduct best interest determinations for unaccompanied alien children to ensure that—

(A) such children with international protection needs are properly registered; and

(B) their needs are properly met, which may include family reunification or resettlement based on international protection needs.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit a report to the committees listed in section 10311(b) that describes the plans of the Secretary of State to assist in developing the refugee processing capabilities described in subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out subsection (a).

Subtitle C—Improving the Efficiency of the Central American Minors Program

SEC. 10331. EXPANSION.

The Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services shall increase the resources directed to the CAM Program, including—

(1) increasing the number of refugee officers available for in-country processing; and

(2) establishing additional site locations.

SEC. 10332. EXPEDITED PROCESSING.

Not later than 180 days after receiving a completed application from an unaccompanied alien child seeking protection under the CAM Program, the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services shall make a final determination on such application unless the security screening for such child cannot be completed during the 180-day period.

SEC. 10333. REFERRAL TO UNHCR.

The Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services or the Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration shall refer any child who is the proposed beneficiary of an application under the CAM Program and is facing immediate risk of harm to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for registration and safe passage to an established emergency transit center for refugees.

TITLE XIV—MONITORING AND SUPPORTING UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN AFTER PROCESSING AT THE BORDER

SEC. 10401. DEFINITIONS; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—Except as otherwise indicated, the term ''Department'' means the Department of Health and Human Services.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement of the Department.

(3) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ''local educational agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(4) RESIDENT ADULT.—The term ''resident adult'' means any individual age 18 or older who regularly lives, shares common areas, and sleeps in a sponsor or prospective sponsor's home.

(5) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise indicated, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.

Subtitle A—Strengthening the Government's Ability To Oversee the Safety and Well-Being of Children

SEC. 10411. BACKGROUND CHECKS TO ENSURE THE SAFE PLACEMENT OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) CRIMINAL AND CIVIL RECORD CHECKS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out the functions transferred to the Director under section 462(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(a)), from amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10401(b) to carry out this section, the Director shall perform, consistent with best practices in the field of child welfare, and a prospective sponsor and all resident adults in the home of the prospective sponsor shall submit to the following record checks (which shall be completed as expeditiously as possible):

(A) Fingerprint-based checks (except as described in paragraph (2)) in national crime information databases, as defined in section 534(e)(3) of title 28, United States Code.

(B) A search of the State criminal registry or repository for any State (except as described in paragraph (3)) in which the prospective sponsor or resident adult has resided during the 5 years preceding the search.

(C) A search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 119 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16919).

(D) A search (except as described in paragraphs (2) and (3)) of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases for any State in which the prospective sponsor or resident adult has resided during the 5 years preceding the search.

(2) PARENTS AND GUARDIANS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), if the prospective sponsor is the parent or guardian of the child involved, the Director shall have discretion to determine whether the Director shall perform, and the prospective sponsor and resident adults described in paragraph (1) shall submit to, a check described in subparagraph (A) or (D) of paragraph (1).

(3) WAIVERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that it is not feasible to conduct the check described in subparagraph (B) or (D) of paragraph (1) for a State, including infeasibility due to a State's refusal or nonresponse in response to a request for related information, or that the average time to receive results from a State for such a check is more

than 10 business days, the Secretary may waive the requirements of that subparagraph with respect to the State involved for a period of not more than 1 year. The Secretary may renew the waiver in accordance with this subparagraph.

(B) PROHIBITION ON DELEGATION.—The Secretary may not delegate the responsibility under subparagraph (A) to another officer or employee of the Department.

(C) STATES WHERE WAIVERS APPLY.—The Secretary shall make available, on a website of the Department, the list of States for which the requirements of subparagraph (B) or (D) of paragraph (1) are waived under this paragraph.

(4) USE OF RECORD CHECKS.—The information revealed by a record check performed pursuant to this section shall be used only by the Director for the purpose of determining whether a potential sponsor is a suitable sponsor for a placement for an unaccompanied alien child.

(b) PLACEMENT DETERMINATIONS GENERALLY.—

(1) DENIALS REQUIRED FOR CERTAIN CRIMES.—The Director shall deny any placement for a prospective sponsor (other than the parent or guardian of the child involved), and may deny any placement for a prospective sponsor who is the parent or guardian of the child involved subject to subsection (c), if the record checks performed pursuant to this section reveal that the prospective sponsor or a resident adult in the home of the prospective sponsor was convicted at age 18 or older of a crime that is a felony consisting of any of the following:

(A) Domestic violence, stalking, child abuse, child neglect, or child abandonment, if the prospective sponsor or resident adult served at least 1 year imprisonment for a crime specified in this subparagraph, or if the prospective sponsor or resident adult was convicted of 2 or more crimes specified in this subparagraph, not arising out of a single scheme of criminal misconduct.

(B) A crime against a child involving pornography.

(C) Human trafficking.

(D) Rape or sexual assault.

(E) Homicide.

(2) DENIALS CONSIDERED FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES.—The Director may deny a placement for a prospective sponsor if the record checks performed pursuant to this section reveal that the prospective sponsor or a resident adult in the home of a prospective sponsor was adjudged guilty of a civil offense or was convicted of a crime not covered by paragraph (1). The Director, in making a determination about whether to approve or deny the placement, shall consider all of the following factors:

(A) The type of offense.

(B) The number of offenses the sponsor or resident adult has been adjudged guilty or convicted of.

(C) The length of time that has elapsed since the adjudication or conviction.

(D) The nature of the offense.

(E) The age of the individual at the time of the adjudication or conviction.

(F) The relationship between the offense and the capacity to care for a child.

(G) Evidence of rehabilitation of the individual.

(H) Opinions of community and family members concerning the individual.

(c) PLACEMENT DETERMINATIONS CONCERNING PARENTS OR GUARDIANS.—The Director may deny a placement for a prospective sponsor who is the parent or guardian of the child involved if the record checks performed pursuant to this section reveal that the prospective sponsor or a resident adult in the home of a prospective sponsor was adjudged guilty of a civil offense or was convicted of a crime. The Director, in making a determination about whether to approve or deny the placement, shall consider all of the factors described in subsection (b)(2).

(d) APPEALS PROCESS.—

(1) INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall provide information to each prospective sponsor on how such sponsor may appeal—

(A) a placement determination under this section, including—

(i) prompt notice of the opportunity to so appeal; and

(ii) instructions about how to participate in the appeals process; and

(B) the results of a record check performed pursuant to this section or the accuracy or completeness of the information yielded by the record check, as provided in paragraph (2), including—

(i) prompt notice of the opportunity to so appeal; and

(ii) instructions about how to participate in the appeals process.

(2) APPEAL.—Each Federal agency responsible for administering or maintaining the information in a database, registry, or repository used in a record check performed pursuant to this section or responsible for the accuracy or completeness of the information yielded by the record check shall—

(A) establish a process for an appeal concerning the results of that record check, or that accuracy or completeness; and

(B) complete such process not later than 30 days after the date on which such an appeal is filed.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Director from establishing additional checks or procedures (besides the checks required in this section) for sponsors, to enable the Director to—

(1) oversee and promote the health, safety, and well-being of unaccompanied alien children; or

(2) prevent the exploitation, neglect, or abuse of unaccompanied alien children.

SEC. 10412. RESPONSIBILITY OF SPONSOR FOR IMMIGRATION COURT COMPLIANCE AND CHILD WELL-BEING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10401(b) to carry out this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall establish procedures to ensure that legal orientation programs regarding immigration court and rights and responsibilities for the well-being of unaccompanied alien children are provided to all prospective sponsors of unaccompanied alien children prior to an unaccompanied alien child's placement with such a sponsor.

(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—The procedures described in subsection (a) shall include a requirement that each legal orientation program described in such subsection shall provide information on the sponsor's rights and responsibilities to—

(1) ensure the unaccompanied alien child appears at immigration proceedings and communicate with the court involved regarding the child's change of address and other relevant information;

(2) immediately enroll the child in school, and shall provide information and resources if the sponsor encounters difficulty enrolling such child in school;

(3) provide access to health care, including mental health care as needed, and any necessary age-appropriate health screening to the child;

(4) report potential child traffickers and other persons seeking to victimize or exploit unaccompanied alien children, or otherwise engage such children in criminal, harmful, or dangerous activity;

(5) seek assistance from the Department regarding the health, safety, and well-being of the child placed with the sponsor; and

(6) file a complaint, if necessary, with the Secretary or the Secretary of Homeland Security regarding treatment of unaccompanied alien children while under the care of the Office of Refugee Resettlement or the Department of Homeland Security, respectively.

SEC. 10413. MONITORING UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) RISK-BASED POST-PLACEMENT SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10401(b) to carry out this section, the Secretary shall, to assist each unaccompanied alien child in a placement with a sponsor—

(A) complete an individualized assessment of the need for services to be provided after placement; and

(B) provide such post-placement services during the pendency of removal proceedings or until no longer necessary.

(2) MINIMUM SERVICES.—For the purposes of paragraph (1), the services shall, at a minimum, include—

(A) for the unaccompanied alien child, at least one post-placement case management services visit within 30 days after placement with a sponsor and the referral of unaccompanied alien children to service providers in the community; and

(B) for the family of the child's sponsor, orientation and other functional family support services, as determined to be necessary in the individualized assessment.

(b) EFFECTIVE USE OF CHILD ADVOCATES FOR THE MOST VULNERABLE UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—The Secretary shall—

(1) direct the Director—

(A) to identify and track the referral rates of unaccompanied alien children to child advocates by care providers and investigate instances in which such a rate is low;

(B) to ensure that the referral criteria established by the Director are appropriately applied when a care provider determines if such a child is eligible for referral to a child advocate;

(C) to provide technical assistance to care providers to ensure compliance with such criteria; and

(D) to establish a process for stakeholders and the public to refer unaccompanied alien children, including those placed with a sponsor, to the child advocate program to determine if such child meets the referral criteria for appointment of a child advocate; and

(2) ensure that each child advocate for an unaccompanied alien child shall—

(A) be provided access to materials necessary to advocate effectively for the best interest of the child, including direct access to significant incident reports, home studies, and similar materials and information; and

(B) be notified when new materials and information described in subparagraph (A) relating to the child are created or become available.

Subtitle B—Funding to States and School Districts; Supporting Education and Safety

SEC. 10421. FUNDING TO STATES TO CONDUCT STATE CRIMINAL CHECKS AND CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT CHECKS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''State'' means each of the 50 States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

(b) PAYMENTS TO STATES TO CONDUCT STATE CRIMINAL REGISTRY OR REPOSITORY SEARCHES AND TO CONDUCT CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT CHECKS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10401(b) to carry out this section, the Secretary shall, in accordance with this subsection, make payments to States, through each agency in each State tasked with administering the

State criminal registry or repository required under section 10411(a)(1)(B) or the State child abuse and neglect registry required under section 10411(a)(1)(D), to assist with searches of such registries, repositories, or databases for prospective sponsors of unaccompanied alien children and resident adults in the home of such prospective sponsors, in accordance with section 10411.

(2) ALLOTMENTS.—

(A) STATE CRIMINAL REGISTRY AND REPOSITORY SEARCHES.—In each fiscal year, using amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10401(b) to carry out this section with respect to the program providing payments to States to assist with criminal registry or repository searches, the Secretary shall allot to each State participating in such program, through the agency in each such State tasked with administering the State criminal registry or repository described in section 10411(a)(1)(B), an amount that bears the same relationship to such funds as the number of searches of such State criminal registry or repository conducted in accordance with section 10411(a)(1)(B) in the State bears to the total number of such searches in all States participating in the program.

(B) CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT CHECKS.—In each fiscal year, using amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10401(b) to carry out this section with respect to the program providing payments to States to assist with child abuse and neglect registry and database searches, the Secretary shall allot to each State participating in such program, through the agency in each such State tasked with administering the State child abuse and neglect registries and databases described in section 10411(a)(1)(D), an amount that bears the same relationship to such funds as the number of searches of such child abuse and neglect registries and databases conducted in accordance with section 10411(a)(1)(D) in the State bears to the total number of such searches in all States participating in the program.

(C) TRANSITION RULE.—In the first fiscal year in which funds are made available under this title to carry out this section, the Secretary shall make allotments to each State participating in the programs under this section in accordance with subparagraphs (A) and (B), based on the Secretary's estimate of the number of the searches described in each such subparagraph, respectively, that each of the States are expected to conduct in such fiscal year.

(3) STATE APPLICATIONS.—Each State agency described in paragraph (1) desiring an allotment under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2) shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, which shall include an assurance that the State agency will respond promptly to all requests from the Director, within a reasonable time period determined by the Director, to conduct a search required under section 10411 in a timely manner, and a description of how funds will be used to meet such assurance.

SEC. 10422. FUNDING TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to section 10401(b) to carry out this section, the Secretary of Education shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible local educational agencies, or consortia of neighboring local educational agencies, described in subsection (b) to enable the local educational agencies or consortia to enhance opportunities for, and provide services to, immigrant children and youth, including unaccompanied alien children, in the area served by the local educational agencies or consortia.

(b) ELIGIBLE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A local educational agency, or a consortium of neighboring local educational agencies, is eligible for a grant under subsection (a) if, during the fiscal year for which a grant is awarded under this section, there are 50 or more unaccompanied alien children enrolled in the public schools served by the local educational agency or the consortium, respectively.

(2) DETERMINATIONS OF NUMBER OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—The Secretary of Education shall determine the number of unaccompanied alien children for purposes of paragraph (1) based on the most accurate data available that is provided to the Secretary of Education by the Director or the Department of Homeland Security.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—A local educational agency, or a consortia of neighboring local educational agencies, desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Education at such time, in such manner, and containing such information, as the Secretary of Education may require, including a description of how the grant will be used to enhance opportunities for, and provide services to, immigrant children and youth (including unaccompanied alien children) and their families.

SEC. 10423. IMMEDIATE ENROLLMENT OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN IN SCHOOLS.

To be eligible for funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), a local educational agency shall—

(1) ensure that unaccompanied alien children in the area served by the local educational agency are immediately enrolled in school following placement with a sponsor; and

(2) remove barriers to enrollment and full participation in educational programs and services offered by the local educational agency for unaccompanied alien children (including barriers related to documentation, age, and language), which shall include reviewing and revising policies that may have a negative effect on such children.

TITLE XV—ENSURING ORDERLY AND HUMANE MANAGEMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SEEKING PROTECTION

Subtitle A—Providing a Fair and Efficient Legal Process for Children and Vulnerable Families Seeking Asylum

SEC. 10511. COURT APPEARANCE COMPLIANCE AND LEGAL ORIENTATION.

(a) ACCESS TO LEGAL ORIENTATION PROGRAMS TO ENSURE COURT APPEARANCE COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall establish procedures, consistent with the procedures established pursuant to section 10412, to ensure that legal orientation programs are available for all aliens detained by the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—Programs under paragraph (1) shall inform aliens described in such paragraph regarding—

(A) the basic procedures of immigration hearings;

(B) their rights and obligations relating to such hearings under Federal immigration laws to ensure appearance at all immigration proceedings;

(C) their rights under Federal immigration laws, including available legal protections and the procedure for requesting such protection;

(D) the consequences of filing frivolous legal claims and of failing to appear for proceedings; and

(E) any other subject that the Attorney General considers appropriate, such as a contact list of potential legal resources and providers.

(3) ELIGIBILITY.—An alien shall be given access to legal orientation programs under this subsection regardless of the alien's current immigration status, prior immigration history, or potential for immigration relief.

(b) PILOT PROJECT FOR NONDETAINED ALIENS IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall develop and administer a 2-year pilot program at not fewer than 2 immigration courts to provide nondetained aliens with pending asylum claims access to legal information.

(2) REPORT.—At the conclusion of the pilot program under this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that describes the extent to which nondetained aliens are provided with access to counsel.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Executive Office of Immigration Review of the Department of Justice such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 10512. FAIR DAY IN COURT FOR KIDS.

(a) IMPROVING IMMIGRATION COURT EFFICIENCY AND REDUCING COSTS BY INCREASING ACCESS TO LEGAL INFORMATION.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL IN CERTAIN CASES; RIGHT TO REVIEW CERTAIN DOCUMENTS IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—Section 240(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking '', at no expense to the Government,''; and

(II) by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively;

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) the Attorney General may appoint or provide counsel to aliens in immigration proceedings;

''(C) at the beginning of the proceedings or as expeditiously as possible, the alien shall automatically receive a complete copy of the alien's Alien File (commonly known as an 'A-file') and Form I–862 (commonly known as a 'Notice to Appear') in the possession of the Department of Homeland Security (other than documents protected from disclosure by privilege, including national security information referred to in subparagraph (D), law enforcement sensitive information, and information prohibited from disclosure pursuant to any other provision of law) unless the alien waives the right to receive such documents by executing a knowing and voluntary written waiver in a language that he or she understands fluently;''; and

(iv) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated, by striking '', and'' and inserting ''; and''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ALIEN REQUIRED DOCUMENTS.—In the absence of a waiver under paragraph (4)(C), a removal proceeding may not proceed until the alien—

''(A) has received the documents as required under such paragraph; and

''(B) has been provided meaningful time to review and assess such documents.''.

(2) CLARIFICATION REGARDING THE AUTHORITY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO APPOINT COUNSEL TO ALIENS IN IMMIGRATION PROCEEDINGS.—Section 292 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1362) is amended—

(A) by striking ''In any'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In any'';

(B) in subsection (a), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''(at no expense to the Government)''; and

(ii) by striking ''he shall'' and inserting ''the person shall''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may appoint or provide counsel to aliens in any proceeding conducted under section 235(b), 236, 238, 240, or 241 or any other section of this Act.

''(2) ACCESS TO COUNSEL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall facilitate access to counsel for—

''(A) aliens in any proceeding conducted under section 235(b), 236, 238, 240, or 241; and

''(B) any individual detained inside an immigration detention facility or a border facility.''.

(3) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ALIENS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 292 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1362), as amended by paragraph (2), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ALIENS.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), the Attorney General shall appoint counsel, at the expense of the Government if necessary, at the beginning of the proceedings or as expeditiously as possible, to represent in such proceedings any alien who has been determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General to be—

''(1) an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)));

''(2) a particularly vulnerable individual, such as—

''(A) a person with a disability (as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102)); or

''(B) a victim of abuse, torture, or violence; or

''(3) an individual whose circumstances are such that the appointment of counsel is necessary to help ensure fair resolution and efficient adjudication of the proceedings.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Executive Office for Immigration Review of the Department of Justice such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.''.

(B) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General shall promulgate regulations to implement section 292(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subparagraph (A), in accordance with the requirements set forth in section 3006A of title 18, United States Code.

(b) CASE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM TO INCREASE COURT APPEARANCE RATES.—

(1) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish a pilot program, which shall include the services set forth in section 10413(a)(2), to increase the court appearance rates of aliens described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 292(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a)(3)(A), by contracting with nongovernmental, community-based organizations to provide appropriate case management services to such aliens.

(2) SCOPE OF SERVICES.—Case management services provided under paragraph (1) shall include assisting aliens with—

(A) accessing legal counsel;

(B) complying with court-imposed deadlines and other legal obligations; and

(C) accessing social services, as appropriate.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Homeland Security such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

(c) REPORT ON ACCESS TO COUNSEL.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than December 31 of each year, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall prepare and submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives regarding the extent to which aliens described in section 292(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a)(3)(A), have been provided access to counsel.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, for the immediately preceding 1-year period—

(A) the number and percentage of aliens described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively, of section 292(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a)(3)(A), who were represented by counsel, including information specifying—

(i) the stage of the legal process at which the alien was represented; and

(ii) whether the alien was in government custody; and

(B) the number and percentage of aliens who received legal orientation presentations.

Subtitle B—Reducing Significant Delays in Immigration Court

SEC. 10521. ELIMINATE IMMIGRATION COURT BACKLOGS.

(a) ANNUAL INCREASES IN IMMIGRATION JUDGES.—The Attorney General shall increase the total number of immigration judges to adjudicate pending cases and efficiently process future cases by at least—

(1) 55 judges during fiscal year 2019;

(2) an additional 55 judges during fiscal year 2020; and

(3) an additional 55 judges during fiscal year 2021.

(b) NECESSARY SUPPORT STAFF FOR IMMIGRATION JUDGES.—To address the shortage of support staff for immigration judges, the Attorney General shall ensure that each immigration judge has sufficient support staff, adequate technological and security resources, and appropriate courtroom facilities.

(c) ANNUAL INCREASES IN BOARD OF IMMIGRATION APPEALS PERSONNEL.—The Attorney General shall increase the number of Board of Immigration Appeals staff attorneys (including necessary additional support staff) to efficiently process cases by at least—

(1) 23 attorneys during fiscal year 2019;

(2) an additional 23 attorneys during fiscal year 2020; and

(3) an additional 23 attorneys during fiscal year 2021.

(d) GAO REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study of the hurdles to efficient hiring of immigration court judges within the Department of Justice; and

(2) propose solutions to Congress for improving the efficiency of the hiring process.

SEC. 10522. IMPROVED TRAINING FOR IMMIGRATION JUDGES AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF IMMIGRATION APPEALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To ensure efficient and fair proceedings, the Director of the Executive Office for Immigration Review shall facilitate robust training programs for immigration judges and members of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

(b) MANDATORY TRAINING.—Training facilitated under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) expanding the training program for new immigration judges and Board members;

(2) continuing education regarding current developments in immigration law through regularly available training resources and an annual conference; and

(3) methods to ensure that immigration judges are trained on properly crafting and dictating decisions and standards of review, including improved on-bench reference materials and decision templates.

SEC. 10523. NEW TECHNOLOGY TO IMPROVE COURT EFFICIENCY.

The Director of the Executive Office for Immigration Review will modernize its case management and related electronic systems, including allowing for electronic filing, to improve efficiency in the processing of immigration proceedings.

Subtitle C—Reducing the Likelihood of Remigration

SEC. 10531. ESTABLISHING REINTEGRATION AND MONITORING SERVICES FOR REPATRIATING CHILDREN.

(a) CONSULTATION WITH UNHCR.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of State, shall consult with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (referred to in this section as the ''UNHCR'') to develop a child-centered repatriation process for unaccompanied children being returned to their country of origin.

(b) COLLABORATION WITH REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS AND NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall collaborate with regional governments and international and domestic nongovernmental organizations to reduce children's need to remigrate by—

(1) establishing and expanding comprehensive reintegration services for repatriated unaccompanied children once returned to their communities of origin;

(2) establishing monitoring and verification services to determine the well-being of repatriated children in order to determine if United States protection and screening functioned effectively in identifying persecuted and trafficked children; and

(3) providing emergency referrals to the UNHCR for registration and safe passage to an established emergency transit center for refugees for any repatriated children who are facing immediate risk of harm.

SA 2032. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. TREATMENT OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE ANALOGUES.

Section 203 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 813) is amended by striking ''shall, to the extent intended for human consumption,'' and inserting the following: ''that is not a chemical substance subject to the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) shall''.

SA 2033. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT ON THE EFFECTS OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES ON MILITARY READINESS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth an assessment by the Secretary of the effects on military readiness of the deportation of aliens who are serving in the Armed Forces, or who are about to commence initial entry training in the Armed Forces, as of the time of deportation.

SA 2034. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PAROLE IN PLACE OF SPOUSES, CHILDREN, AND PARENTS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS AND FORMER OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) PAROLE IN PLACE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, pursuant to section 212(a)(5)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)(a)), parole in place any alien who is the spouse, child, or parent of the following:

(1) A current or former member of a regular component of the Armed Forces.

(2) A current or former member of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Parole is not required under subsection (a) to an alien otherwise described in that subsection if the Secretary, in the Secretary's discretion, determines that parole under this section is inadvisable based on the Secretary's determination that the alien—

(1) has been convicted of a criminal offense; or

(2) presents another serious adverse factor.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''spouse'', ''child'', and ''parent'' have the meaning given such terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C.

SA 2035. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PLAN ON THE HUMANE TREATMENT OF DETAINEES BY IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, acting though the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, submit to Congress and implement a plan for Immigration and Customs Enforcement to address deficiencies in its detainee classification, use of segregation and disciplinary actions, compliance with grievance procedures, detainee care, and other deficiencies cited in the report of the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security entitled ''Concerns About ICE Detainee Treatment and Care at Detention Facilities'' and dated December 11, 2017.

SA 2036. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. _____. PAROLE IN PLACE OF SPOUSES, CHILDREN, AND PARENTS OF CITIZENS AND LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS SERVING IN CERTAIN PUBLIC SERVICE PROFESSIONS.

(a) PAROLE IN PLACE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, pursuant to section 212(a)(5)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)(a)), parole in place any alien who is the spouse, child, or parent of a citizen or lawful permanent resident serving as any of the following:

(1) Law enforcement officer, official, or agent.

(2) Firefighter.

(3) Emergency medical technician.

(4) Doctor, physician assistant, nurse, or other healthcare provider.

(5) First responder.

(6) Teacher.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Parole is not required under subsection (a) to an alien otherwise described in that subsection if the Secretary, in the Secretary's discretion, determines that parole under this section is inadvisable based on the Secretary's determination that the alien—

(1) has been convicted of a criminal offense; or

(2) presents another serious adverse factor.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''spouse'', ''child'', and ''parent'' have the meaning given such terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

SA 2037. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DISTRICT JUDGES FOR THE DISTRICT COURTS.

(a) ADDITIONAL PERMANENT DISTRICT COURT JUDGESHIPS.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(1) 7 additional district judges for the central district of California;

(2) 3 additional district judges for the eastern district of California;

(3) 2 additional district judges for the district of New Mexico;

(4) 2 additional district judges for the southern district of Texas; and

(5) 4 additional district judges for the western district of Texas.

(b) CONVERSIONS OF TEMPORARY DISTRICT COURT JUDGESHIPS.—The existing judgeships for the district of Arizona, the central district of California, and the district of New Mexico authorized by section 312(c) of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (Public Law 107–273, 28 U.S.C. 133 note), as of the effective date of this Act, shall be authorized under section 133 of title 28, United States Code, and the incumbents in those offices shall hold the office under section 133 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act.

(c) TABLES.—In order that the table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, will, with respect to each judicial district, reflect the changes in the total number of permanent district judgeships authorized as a result of subsection (a)—

(1) the item relating to Arizona is amended to read as follows:

''Arizona	13'';

(2) the item relating to California is amended to read as follows:

''California:	
Northern	14
Eastern	9
Central	35
Southern	13'';

(3) the item relating to New Mexico is amended to read as follows:

''New Mexico	9'';

and

(4) by striking the item relating to Texas and inserting the following:

''Texas:	
Northern	12
Southern	21
Eastern	7
Western	17''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 21, 2021.

SA 2038. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1959 proposed by Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ISAKSON) to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ELEMENTS OF THE PHYSICAL BARRIERS ALONG THE SOUTHERN BORDER PENDING A CERTIFICATION ON THE ACHIEVEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY OF CERTAIN STAFFING LEVELS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, construction of any new element of the physical barriers along the southern border (other than construction for repair or replacement of existing barrier elements) may not commence until the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies, in writing, to Congress that the total number of officers in the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection equals the number required for the fiscal year in which the certification is submitted in the Workload Staffing Model of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

SA 2039. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1958 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. KING, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COONS, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. WARNER) to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROTECTION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES AND WILDLIFE CORRIDORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not use any funds for the design and construction of physical barriers along the border between the United States and Mexico for pedestrian barriers at any of the following:

(1) National Wildlife Refuge System land in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas.

(2) The wildlife corridor in Hidalgo County, New Mexico, from coordinates N. 31.3331, W. 108.714 to N. 31.3324, W. 108.786.

(3) The wildlife corridor in the Chiricahua Mountains, from coordinates N. 31.3324, W.108.982 to N. 31.3328, W. 109.092.

(4) San Bernardino National Wildlife Refuge, Arizona.

(5) The wildlife corridor in the Coronado National Forest, Arizona, from coordinates N. 31.3336, W. 110.246 to N. 31.336, W. 110.782.

(6) The wildlife corridor in the Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge and the Coronado National Forest, Arizona, from coordinates N. 31.3322, W. 111.038 to N. 31.3992, W. 111.283.

(7) Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge, Arizona.

(8) The wildlife corridor in Jacumba, California, from coordinates N. 32.6272, W. 115.995 to N. 32.6242, W. 116.035.

(b) LIMITATION.—The only physical barrier that may be constructed at a wildlife refuge or wildlife corridor described in subsection (a) shall be a vehicle barrier or other barrier that—

(1) meets operational needs;

(2) does not impede the free movement of wildlife; and

(3) does not create or exacerbate the potential for flooding in the area.

SA 2040. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. SMITH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIONALS OF LIBERIA.

(a) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) ELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall adjust the status of an alien described in subsection (b) to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien—

(i) applies for adjustment not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) is otherwise eligible to receive an immigrant visa and admissible to the United States for permanent residence, except that, in determining such admissibility, the grounds for inadmissibility specified in paragraphs (4), (5), (6)(A), and (7)(A) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)) shall not apply.

(B) INELIGIBLE ALIENS.—An alien shall not be eligible for adjustment of status under this section if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that the alien—

(i) has been convicted of any aggravated felony (as defined in section 101(a)(43) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43)));

(ii) has been convicted of 2 or more crimes involving moral turpitude; or

(iii) has ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

(2) RELATIONSHIP OF APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ORDERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An alien present in the United States who has been subject to an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal, or has been ordered to depart voluntarily from the United States under any provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) may, notwithstanding such order, apply for adjustment of status under paragraph (1) if otherwise qualified under such paragraph.

(B) SEPARATE MOTION NOT REQUIRED.—An alien described in subparagraph (A) may not be required, as a condition of submitting or granting such application, to file a separate motion to reopen, reconsider, or vacate the order described in subparagraph (A).

(C) EFFECT OF DECISION BY SECRETARY.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security adjusts the status of an alien pursuant to an application under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall cancel the order described in subparagraph (A). If the Secretary of Homeland Security makes a final decision to deny such adjustment of status, the order shall be effective and enforceable to the same extent as if the application had not been made.

(b) ALIENS ELIGIBLE FOR ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The benefits provided under subsection (a) shall apply to any alien—

(A) who is—

(i) a national of Liberia; and

(ii) has been continuously present in the United States between November 20, 2014, and the date on which the alien submits an application under subsection (a); or

(B) who is the spouse, child, or unmarried son or daughter of an alien described in subparagraph (A).

(2) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PHYSICAL PRESENCE.—For purposes of establishing the period of continuous physical presence referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(ii), an alien shall not be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence by reasons of an absence, or absences, from the United States for any period or periods amounting in the aggregate to not more than 180 days.

(c) STAY OF REMOVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall promulgate regulations establishing procedures through which an alien, who is subject to a final order of deportation, removal, or exclusion, may seek a stay of such order based upon the filing of an application under subsection (a).

(2) DURING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS.—Notwithstanding any provision in the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), the Secretary of Homeland Security may not order an alien to be removed from the United States if the alien is in exclusion, deportation, or removal proceedings under any provision of such Act and has applied for adjustment of status under subsection (a) unless the Secretary has made a final determination to deny the application.

(3) WORK AUTHORIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may—

(i) authorize an alien who has applied for adjustment of status under subsection (a) to engage in employment in the United States while a determination regarding such application is pending; and

(ii) provide the alien with an ''employment authorized'' endorsement or other appropriate document signifying authorization of employment.

(B) PENDING APPLICATIONS.—If an application for adjustment of status under subsection (a) is pending for a period exceeding 180 days and has not been denied, the Secretary shall authorize such employment.

(d) RECORD OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE.—Upon the approval of an alien's application for adjustment of status under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish a record of the alien's admission for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's arrival in the United States.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide applicants for adjustment of status under subsection (a) with the same right to, and procedures for, administrative review as are provided to—

(1) applicants for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255); and

(2) aliens subject to removal proceedings under section 240 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a).

(f) LIMITATION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A determination by the Secretary of Homeland Security regarding the adjustment of status of any alien under this section is final and shall not be subject to review by any court.

(g) NO OFFSET IN NUMBER OF VISAS AVAILABLE.—The Secretary of State shall not be required to reduce the number of immigrant visas authorized to be issued under any provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) to offset the adjustment of status of an alien who has been lawfully admitted for permanent residence pursuant to this section.

(h) APPLICATION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT PROVISIONS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, the definitions contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) shall apply in this section.

(2) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to repeal, amend, alter, modify, effect, or restrict the powers, duties, function, or authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security in the administration and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act or any other law relating to immigration, nationality, or naturalization.

(3) EFFECT OF ELIGIBILITY FOR ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—An alien's eligibility to be lawfully admitted for permanent residence under this section shall not preclude the alien from seeking any status under any other provision of law for which the alien may otherwise be eligible.

SA 2041. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. USING ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING PROCEEDS FOR BORDER SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to authorize the use of illicit drug trafficking proceeds to pay for physical barriers, tactical infrastructure, and technology in the vicinity of the United States border, which will achieve situational awareness and operational control of the border, and increase the interdiction of illicit drugs entering the United States and reduce bulk cash smuggling and trade-based money laundering along the border.

(b) SECURE AMERICA FINANCING CORPORATION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established , as a special purpose, public corporate entity, the Secure America Financing Corporation (referred to in this subsection as the ''Corporation''), which shall operate as an independent instrumentality of the Federal Government.

(2) BOARD.—

(A) COMPOSITION.—The Corporation shall be overseen by a Board, consisting of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, or their respective designees, as appointed by the President.

(B) TERMS.—Members of the Board shall serve, at the pleasure of the President, for 4-year terms, or until a successor is appointed by the President. Members of the Board may be appointed to 1 additional 4-year term.

(C) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Board shall serve without additional compensation.

(D) CHAIRPERSON.—The Board shall annually elect a Chairperson from among its members.

(E) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet not less frequently than annually.

(3) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Corporation shall be—

(A) to issue Secure America Bonds, in accordance with paragraph (4);

(B) to make the proceeds of such bonds available to the Homeland Security Investigations directorate of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and to U.S. Border Patrol to enhance technological capacity; and

(C) to manage surplus Asset Forfeiture Funds to redeem such bonds.

(4) BONDS.—

(A) ISSUANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Corporation may issue bonds (referred to in this section as ''Secure America Bonds'') in such amounts and for such terms as the Board shall authorize to provide the necessary funding for the technological capacity enhancements that the Homeland Security Investigations directorate determines appropriate.

(B) REDEMPTION.—Bonds issued pursuant to subparagraph (A) may only be paid from funds managed by the Corporation, including—

(i) surplus amounts from the Asset Forfeiture Fund;

(ii) proceeds of the sales of any such bonds;

(iii) earnings on funds invested by the Corporation or the indenture trustee;

(iv) income generated by the activities of the Corporation; and

(v) such other funds as may become available.

(C) BANKRUPTCY PROHIBITED.—The Corporation may not file for bankruptcy protection while any of the bonds issued by the Corporation remain outstanding.

(D) LIMITATION.—Bonds issued pursuant to subparagraph (A)—

(i) are not a debt or obligation of the Federal Government; and

(ii) are not backed by the full faith and credit of the Federal Government.

(5) STAFFING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Employees of the Department of Homeland Security and employees of the Department of the Treasury may provide administrative support to the Corporation.

(B) PROFESSIONAL SERVICES.—The Attorney General, or designee, may serve as counsel to the Corporation and may employee or retain such other attorneys as necessary. The Corporation may employ or retain any other professionals, consultants, agents, financial advisors, and accountants as may be necessary to carry out the purposes set forth in paragraph (3). The Board may determine the duties and compensation of those employed or retained under this subparagraph.

(6) FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—The Corporation is authorized to sell and convey any of the assets of the Corporation, subject to the approval of the Board.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION.—The Corporation shall be exempt from any taxation, fees, assessments, or similar charges based on the real property or assets of the Corporation.

(7) EFFECT OF DISSOLUTION.—Upon the dissolution of the Corporation, title to all assets and properties of the Corporation shall vest in and become the property of the United States Treasury and shall be deposited into and credited to the Asset Forfeiture Fund.

(c) USE OF CERTAIN FORFEITED CRIMINAL PROCEEDS FOR BORDER SECURITY MEASURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds that are criminally forfeited to the United States pursuant to an order relating to a sentence of a felony conviction by a district court of the United States of an individual engaging in a continuing criminal enterprise involving knowingly and intentionally distributing a controlled substance, intending and knowing that such substance would be unlawfully imported into the United States from a place outside of the United States shall be used for security measures along the international border between the United States and Mexico, including the construction, installation, deployment, operation, and maintenance of physical barriers, tactical infrastructure, and technology in the vicinity of such border, for the purpose of stemming the flow of illegal narcotics into the United States and furthering the security of the United States.

(d) RESERVATION OF PORTION OF FORFEITS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CIVIL ASSET FORFEITURE FUND FOR BUILDING A PHYSICAL BARRIER OR ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TO PREVENT ILLEGAL ENTRY ACROSS THE SOUTHERN BORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 524(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', except as provided in paragraph (12),'' before ''be available to the Attorney General'';

(B) in paragraph (8)(E), in the first sentence, by inserting ''the construction, installation, deployment, operation, and maintenance of physical barriers, tactical infrastructure, and technology in the vicinity of the United States border,'' after ''law enforcement,''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(12)(A) Not later than on December 1 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the total of any amount in the Fund as of October 1 that are derived from Mexican cartels.

''(B) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and occasionally thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the amount in the Fund that has historically been derived from Mexican cartels.

''(C) Of the amount described in subparagraph (A), 50 percent shall be made available without fiscal year limitation to install additional physical barriers and roads (including the removal of obstacles to detection of illegal entrants) in the vicinity of the United States border to deter illegal crossings in areas of high illegal entry into the United States.''.

(2) LIMITATION ON RELEASE OF PROPERTY.—Section 983(f)(8) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) is currency or contraband likely to belong to or used in support of a foreign, illegal trafficking organization.''.

(e) USE OF BOND PROCEEDS.—

(1) IMPROVING DATA ANALYTICS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Executive Associate Director for Homeland Security Investigations and the Chief, U.S. Border Patrol, may use proceeds from Secure America Bonds—

(A) to improve the use of data and advanced analytics to target drugs entering the United States, bulk cash smugglers, and trade-based money laundering;

(B) to prioritize the use of ''big data'' to enhance the analysis of information that may lead to an increase in drug seizures near the border, the interdiction of smuggled bulk cash, and the identification of invoice misrepresentation that leads to trade-based money laundering;

(C) to increase the technological capacity to gather and develop information about persons, events, and cargo of interest;

(D) to integrate data with analytical tools capable of—

(i) detecting trends, patterns, and emerging threats; and

(ii) identifying nonobvious relationships between persons, events, and cargo to generate the necessary tools to increase seizures; and

(E) to procure technology for advanced analytics to target drugs coming into the United States, bulk cash smuggling, and trade-based money laundering.

(2) PHYSICAL BARRIERS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Chief, U.S. Border Patrol, may use proceeds from Secure America Bonds—

(A) to achieve situational awareness and operational control of the southwest border using terrain, barriers, and technological and human resources to force smugglers to use certain routes and border crossings;

(B) to construct, install, deploy, operate, and permanently maintain physical barriers, tactical infrastructure, and technology in the vicinity of the southwest border.

(3) STAFFING.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Executive Associate Director for Homeland Security Investigations, may use proceeds from Secure America Bonds to employ the necessary analysts to carry out the data analytics described in paragraph (1).

(f) RULES OF CIVIL FORFEITURE.—

(1) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—Section 983(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) In any law enforcement action in which assets may be seized under this subsection, the law enforcement officer may not barter with or otherwise pressure the owner of the assets to be seized to waive any rights relating to the recovery of such assets.''.

(2) GENERAL RULES FOR CIVIL FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS.—Section 983(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''a preponderance of the evidence'' and inserting ''clear and convincing evidence'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''a preponderance of the evidence'' and inserting ''clear and convincing evidence''; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting '', by clear and convincing evidence,'' after ''establish''.

(3) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that includes a detailed record, for the reporting period, of all civil and

criminal asset seizures and forfeitures authorized under chapter 46 of title 18, United States Code, including—

(A) the specific assets seized, including the quantity and value of such assets;

(B) the alleged criminal conduct giving rise to the seizure or forfeiture;

(C) whether anyone was arrested or convicted of the alleged criminal conduct;

(D) whether the forfeiture action was challenged by the owner of the assets;

(E) the final disposition of the assets; and

(F) if the assets were sold, how the proceeds of the assets were used.

(g) DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY FORFEITURE FUND.—Section 9705 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by adding at the end the following:

''(K) Payment to enhance border security.''; and

(2) in subsection (g)(4)(B), by inserting '', including the construction, installation, deployment, operation, and maintenance of physical barriers, tactical infrastructure, and technology in the vicinity of such border,'' after ''law enforcement activities''.

SA 2042. Mr. ALEXANDER (for Mr. FLAKE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 946, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Veterans Treatment Court Improvement Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. HIRING BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OF ADDITIONAL VETERANS JUSTICE OUTREACH SPECIALISTS.

(a) HIRING OF ADDITIONAL VETERANS JUSTICE OUTREACH SPECIALISTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall hire not fewer than 50 Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists and place each such Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist at an eligible Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in accordance with this section.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that each Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist employed under paragraph (1)—

(A) serves, either exclusively or in addition to other duties, as part of a justice team in a veterans treatment court or other veteran-focused court; and

(B) otherwise meets Department hiring guidelines for Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists.

(3) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The Secretary shall ensure that the total number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists employed by the Department is not less than the sum of—

(A) the total number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists that were employed by the Department on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) the number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists set forth in paragraph (1).

(b) ELIGIBLE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTERS.—For purposes of this section, an eligible Department of Veterans Affairs medical center is any Department of Veterans Affairs medical center that—

(1) complies with all Department guidelines and regulations for placement of a Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist;

(2) works within a local criminal justice system with justice-involved veterans;

(3) maintains an affiliation with one or more veterans treatment courts or other veteran-focused courts; and

(4) either—

(A) routinely provides Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to serve as part of a justice team in a veterans treatment court or other veteran-focused court; or

(B) establishes a plan that is approved by the Secretary to provide Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists employed under subsection (a)(1) to serve as part of a justice team in a veterans treatment court or other veteran-focused court.

(c) PLACEMENT PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall prioritize the placement of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists employed under subsection (a)(1) at eligible Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers that have or intend to establish an affiliation, for the purpose of carrying out the Veterans Justice Outreach Program, with a veterans treatment court, or other veteran-focused court, that—

(1) was established on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2)(A) was established before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) is not fully staffed with Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) PERIODIC REPORTS BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once every year thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section and its effect on the Veterans Justice Outreach Program.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(i) The status of the efforts of the Secretary to hire Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists pursuant to subsection (a)(1), including the total number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists hired by the Secretary pursuant to such subsection and the number that the Secretary expects to hire pursuant to such subsection.

(ii) The total number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists assigned to each Department of Veterans Affairs medical center that participates in the Veterans Justice Outreach Program, including the number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists hired under subsection (a)(1) disaggregated by Department of Veterans Affairs medical center.

(iii) The total number of eligible Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers that sought placement of a Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist under subsection (a)(1), how many Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists each such center sought, and how many of such medical centers received no placement of a Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist under subsection (a)(1).

(iv) The total number of justice-involved veterans who were served or are expected to be served by a Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist hired under subsection (a)(1).

(2) REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section and the effectiveness of the Veterans Justice Outreach Program.

(B) CONTENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An assessment of whether the Secretary has fulfilled the Secretary's obligations under this section.

(ii) The number of veterans who are served by Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists hired under subsection (a)(1), disaggregated by demographics (including discharge status).

(iii) An identification of any subgroups of veterans who underutilize services provided under laws administered by the Secretary and to which they are referred by a Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist.

(iv) Such recommendations as the Comptroller General may have for the Secretary to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans Justice Outreach Program.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out subsection (a) $5,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2028.

(2) IDENTIFICATION OF OFFSETS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that identifies such legislative or administrative actions as the Secretary determines will result in a reduction in expenditures by the Department of Veterans Affairs that is equal to or greater than the amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) JUSTICE TEAM.—The term ''justice team'' means the group of individuals, which may include a judge, court coordinator, prosecutor, public defender, treatment provider, probation or other law enforcement officer, program mentor, and Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist, who assist justice-involved veterans in a veterans treatment court or other veteran-focused court.

(2) JUSTICE-INVOLVED VETERAN.—The term ''justice-involved veteran'' means a veteran with active, ongoing, or recent contact with some component of a local criminal justice system.

(3) LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.—The term ''local criminal justice system'' means law enforcement, jails, prisons, and Federal, State, and local courts.

(4) VETERANS JUSTICE OUTREACH PROGRAM.—The term ''Veterans Justice Outreach Program'' means the program through which the Department of Veterans Affairs identifies justice-involved veterans and provides such veterans with access to Department services.

(5) VETERANS JUSTICE OUTREACH SPECIALIST.—The term ''Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist'' means an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs who serves as a liaison between the Department and the local criminal justice system on behalf of a justice-involved veteran.

(6) VETERANS TREATMENT COURT.—The term ''veterans treatment court'' means a Federal, State, or local court that is participating in the veterans treatment court program (as defined in section 2991(i)(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(i)(1))).

SA 2043. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROVIDING LEGAL PROTECTION FOR CERTAIN CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—The term ''eligible individual'' means an individual who meets the eligibility criteria described in subsection (b)(2).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(b) DEFERRED ACTION STATUS.—

(1) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall establish a program through which an eligible individual may apply for deferred action status.

(2) ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—An individual shall be eligible for deferred action status under the program established under paragraph (1) if the individual—

(A) on June 15, 2012, was under the age of 31 years;

(B) entered the United States—

(i) on a date on which the alien was under the age of 16 years; and

(ii) without inspection or lawful status before June 15, 2012;

(C) has continuously resided in the United States since June 15, 2007;

(D) was physically present in the United States—

(i) on June 15, 2012; and

(ii) on the date on which the Secretary makes a determination with respect to the eligibility of the individual for deferred action status;

(E)(i) is in school;

(ii) has—

(I) graduated from high school; or

(II) obtained—

(aa) a certificate of completion from a high school; or

(bb) a general education development certificate; or

(iii) is—

(I) a member of the armed forces (as defined in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code), including a member of the National Guard or Reserves; or

(II) a veteran, as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code, except that an individual discharged other than honorably is excluded;

(F) has not been convicted of—

(i) a felony;

(ii) a significant misdemeanor; or

(iii) 3 or more misdemeanor offenses;

(G) does not pose a threat to national security or public safety; and

(H) was granted deferred action status before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) PERIOD OF DEFERRED ACTION STATUS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), deferred action status granted under this subsection shall be valid for a period of 2 years beginning on the date on which the Secretary grants deferred action status to the eligible individual.

(B) RENEWAL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—On application to the Secretary, deferred action status granted under this subsection may be renewed for additional 2-year periods.

(ii) RENEWAL APPLICATION.—Not more than 120 days before the date on which the deferred action status of an eligible individual expires, the eligible individual may submit to the Secretary an application for renewal of deferred action status.

SEC. ___. BORDER SECURITY TRUST FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the Border Security Trust Fund (in this section referred to as the ''Trust Fund''), consisting of amounts appropriated to the Trust Fund under subsection (b) and any amounts that may be credited to the Trust Fund under subsection (c).

(b) APPROPRIATION.—There are appropriated to the Trust Fund $25,000,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(c) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest such portion of the Trust Fund as is not required to meet current withdrawals in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

(2) INTEREST AND PROCEEDS.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Trust Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Trust Fund.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available to the Secretary of Homeland Security, without further appropriation, for—

(A) construction of not fewer than 700 miles of reinforced fencing, excluding vehicle barriers;

(B) installation of additional physical barriers;

(C) construction and maintenance of access and patrol roads;

(D) lighting;

(E) an interlocking surveillance camera system;

(F) remote sensors; and

(G) the purchase from the Secretary of Defense of surplus aircraft and unmanned aircraft systems.

(2) LIMITATION.—Not more than $5,000,000,000 of the amount in the Trust Fund may be obligated and expended in any fiscal year.

SEC. _____. ANNUAL REPORT ON BORDER SECURITY.

Not less frequently than once each fiscal year, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit annually to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report that describes for the applicable fiscal year—

(1) the status of the construction of fencing and security improvements at United States borders; and

(2) the estimated number of unlawful border crossings.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 15, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 15, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 15, 2018, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The President's Fiscal Year 2019 Budget.''

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 15, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Andrea L. Thompson, of South Dakota, to be Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, Susan A. Thornton, of Maine, to be an Assistant Secretary (East Asian and Pacific Affairs), and Francis R. Fannon, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Energy Resources), all of Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 14, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on S. 1917 and the following nominations: Michael B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Susan Paradise Baxter, and Marilyn Jean Horan, both to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Daniel Desmond Domenico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Adam I. Klein, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman and Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, McGregor W. Scott, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of California, Gary G. Schofield, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada, and Jonathan F. Mitchell, of Washington, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 14, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 413, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 413) celebrating Black History Month.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 413) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

VETERANS TREATMENT COURT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 946 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 946) to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Flake substitute amendment be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 2042) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Veterans Treatment Court Improvement Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. HIRING BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OF ADDITIONAL VETERANS JUSTICE OUTREACH SPECIALISTS.

(a) HIRING OF ADDITIONAL VETERANS JUSTICE OUTREACH SPECIALISTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall hire not fewer than 50 Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists and place each such Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist at an eligible Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in accordance with this section.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that each Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist employed under paragraph (1)—

(A) serves, either exclusively or in addition to other duties, as part of a justice team in a veterans treatment court or other veteran-focused court; and

(B) otherwise meets Department hiring guidelines for Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists.

(3) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The Secretary shall ensure that the total number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists employed by the Department is not less than the sum of—

(A) the total number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists that were employed by the Department on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) the number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists set forth in paragraph (1).

(b) ELIGIBLE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTERS.—For purposes of this section, an eligible Department of Veterans Affairs medical center is any Department of Veterans Affairs medical center that—

(1) complies with all Department guidelines and regulations for placement of a Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist;

(2) works within a local criminal justice system with justice-involved veterans;

(3) maintains an affiliation with one or more veterans treatment courts or other veteran-focused courts; and

(4) either—

(A) routinely provides Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to serve as part of a justice team in a veterans treatment court or other veteran-focused court; or

(B) establishes a plan that is approved by the Secretary to provide Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists employed under subsection (a)(1) to serve as part of a justice team in a veterans treatment court or other veteran-focused court.

(c) PLACEMENT PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall prioritize the placement of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists employed under subsection (a)(1) at eligible Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers that have or intend to establish an affiliation, for the purpose of carrying out the Veterans Justice Outreach Program, with a veterans treatment court, or other veteran-focused court, that—

(1) was established on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2)(A) was established before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) is not fully staffed with Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) PERIODIC REPORTS BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once every year thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section and its effect on the Veterans Justice Outreach Program.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(i) The status of the efforts of the Secretary to hire Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists pursuant to subsection (a)(1), including the total number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists hired by the Secretary pursuant to such subsection and the number that the Secretary expects to hire pursuant to such subsection.

(ii) The total number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists assigned to each Department of Veterans Affairs medical center that participates in the Veterans Justice Outreach Program, including the number of Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists hired under subsection (a)(1) disaggregated by Department of Veterans Affairs medical center.

(iii) The total number of eligible Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers that sought placement of a Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist under subsection (a)(1), how many Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists each such center sought, and how many of such medical centers received no placement of a Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist under subsection (a)(1).

(iv) The total number of justice-involved veterans who were served or are expected to be served by a Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist hired under subsection (a)(1).

(2) REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section and the effectiveness of the Veterans Justice Outreach Program.

(B) CONTENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An assessment of whether the Secretary has fulfilled the Secretary's obligations under this section.

(ii) The number of veterans who are served by Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists hired under subsection (a)(1), disaggregated by demographics (including discharge status).

(iii) An identification of any subgroups of veterans who underutilize services provided under laws administered by the Secretary and to which they are referred by a Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist.

(iv) Such recommendations as the Comptroller General may have for the Secretary to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans Justice Outreach Program.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out subsection (a) $5,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2028.

(2) IDENTIFICATION OF OFFSETS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that identifies such legislative or administrative actions as the Secretary determines will result in a reduction in expenditures by the Department of Veterans Affairs that is equal to or greater than the amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) JUSTICE TEAM.—The term ''justice team'' means the group of individuals, which may include a judge, court coordinator, prosecutor, public defender, treatment provider, probation or other law enforcement officer, program mentor, and Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist, who assist justice-involved veterans in a veterans treatment court or other veteran-focused court.

(2) JUSTICE-INVOLVED VETERAN.—The term ''justice-involved veteran'' means a veteran with active, ongoing, or recent contact with some component of a local criminal justice system.

(3) LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.—The term ''local criminal justice system'' means law enforcement, jails, prisons, and Federal, State, and local courts.

(4) VETERANS JUSTICE OUTREACH PROGRAM.—The term ''Veterans Justice Outreach Program'' means the program through which the Department of Veterans Affairs identifies justice-involved veterans and provides such veterans with access to Department services.

(5) VETERANS JUSTICE OUTREACH SPECIALIST.—The term ''Veterans Justice Outreach Specialist'' means an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs who serves as a liaison between the Department and the local criminal justice system on behalf of a justice-involved veteran.

(6) VETERANS TREATMENT COURT.—The term ''veterans treatment court'' means a Federal, State, or local court that is participating in the veterans treatment court program (as defined in section 2991(i)(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(i)(1))).

The bill (S. 946), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO SUBMIT CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1725 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1725) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit certain reports relating to medical evidence submitted in support of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 1725) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

VETERANS CARE FINANCIAL PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3122 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3122) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include on the internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs a warning regarding dishonest, predatory, or otherwise unlawful practices targeting individuals who are eligible for increased pension on the basis of need for regular aid and attendance, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 3122) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LEXINGTON VA HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4533, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4533) to designate the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Lexington, Kentucky, as the ''Lexington VA Health Care System'' and to make certain other designations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 4533) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

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

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 93–112, as amended by Public Law 112–166, and further amended by Public Law 113–128, the reappointment of the following to serve as a member of the National Council on Disability: Neil Romano of Maryland.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2018, THROUGH MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2018

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, February 16 at 12 noon; Tuesday, February 20 at 5 p.m.; Friday, February 23 at 2 p.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, February 23, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, February 26, and 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 the closing of morning business, Senator PETERS be recognized to deliver Washington's Farewell Address; further, that following the address, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Branch nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Branch nomination occur at 5:30 p.m., Monday, February 26.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:58 p.m., adjourned until Friday, February 16, 2018, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NAOMI C. EARP, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, VICE JOE LEONARD, JR.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

THELMA DRAKE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATOR, VICE PETER M. ROGOFF, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

JAMES REILLY, OF COLORADO, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, VICE SUZETTE M. KIMBALL.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOSEPH CELLA, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF FIJI, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KIRIBATI, THE REPUBLIC OF NAURU, THE KINGDOM OF TONGA, AND TUVALU.

DAVID B. CORNSTEIN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO HUNGARY.

GEORGETTE MOSBACHER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

JEAN CAROL HOVLAND, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF THE ADMINISTRATION FOR NATIVE AMERICANS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE LILLIAN A. SPARKS.

THE JUDICIARY

MARK JEREMY BENNETT, OF HAWAII, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE RICHARD R. CLIFTON, RETIRED.

NANCY E. BRASEL, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA, VICE ANN D. MONTGOMERY, RETIRED.

THOMAS S. KLEEH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA, VICE IRENE M. KEELEY, RETIRED.

ANDREW S. OLDHAM, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, VICE EDWARD C. PRADO, RETIRING.

PETER J. PHIPPS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE TERRENCE F. MCVERRY, RETIRED.

MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT, VICE RICHARD A. POSNER, RETIRED.

AMY J. ST. EVE, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT, VICE ANN CLAIRE WILLIAMS, RETIRED.

ERIC C. TOSTRUD, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA, VICE DONOVAN W. FRANK, RETIRED.

CHARLES J. WILLIAMS, OF IOWA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA, VICE LINDA R. READE, RETIRED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 15, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

JOHN MARSHALL MITNICK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN C. DEMERS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NEIL JACOBS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOSEPH D. BROWN, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

MATTHEW D. KRUEGER, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

NORMAN EUELL ARFLACK, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

TED G. KAMATCHUS, OF IOWA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOEL DANIES, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE GABONESE REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN H. DURHAM, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

MICHAEL T. BAYLOUS, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DANIEL R. MCKITTRICK, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN HENDERSON, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

MICHAEL D. GRIFFIN, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING.

WILLIAM ROPER, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

PHYLLIS L. BAYER, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

HOLLY W. GREAVES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN H. GIBSON II, OF TEXAS, TO BE CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

MELISSA F. BURNISON, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (CONGRESSIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PETER HENDRICK VROOMAN, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF RWANDA.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN C. ANDERSON, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

BRANDON J. FREMIN, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JOSEPH P. KELLY, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

SCOTT W. MURRAY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DAVID C. WEISS, OF DELAWARE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DAVID G. JOLLEY, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

THOMAS M. GRIFFIN, JR., OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

LISA GORDON–HAGERTY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

KEVIN FAHEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

THOMAS E. AYRES, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING PAUL CLARK AS THE WEST SENECA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Paul Clark of West Seneca as he is presented with the 2018 Citizen of the Year Award by the West Seneca Chamber of Commerce at Kloc's Grove. Paul has proven a recognized leader in his community through his extensive public service.

Paul has worked as a certified public accountant for over four decades. He belongs to the New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants and is a partner at the firm Clark & Nihill. As a member of the Construction Exchange of the New York Board of Governors, he has trained local contractors in accounting and finance.

As a leader, mentor, and engaged neighbor, Paul has been a Cub Scout Den Leader, coach of St. John Vianney's Boys Basketball, and sponsor of West Seneca Girls Softball. He has belonged to the local Rotary Chapter for over thirty years, serving in every position.

Initiatives Paul has been involved with have improved quality of life in Western New York, and include bringing the Koessler Center to Canisius College, and assisting in the chartering and organization of the board of the Burchfield Nature and Art Center. As a member of the YMCA Capital Board he advised members to create Ismailia Shrine Temple and to bring the Y to the Southtowns.

Paul's volunteer efforts reflect his commitment to history, economic development, education, healthcare and an appreciation for an iconic American automobile. The Pan-Am Exposition Society, West Seneca Development Corp., Bennett High School, Mercy Flight, and the Western New York Mustang Car Club have benefitted from his good and generous works.

Mr. Speaker, I want to honor Mr. Paul Clark as the West Seneca Chamber of Commerce's 2018 Citizen of the Year. His dedication to our community is commendable, and I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

CELEBRATING THE CITY OF ROCKLIN, CA 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the City of Rocklin, California celebrates its 125th Anniversary on February 24, 2018. The city was incorporated on February 24, 1893, becoming the 95th city in California.

Rocklin has a vibrant history. Through grit, determination and hard work, the City built a foundation on granite mining and railroads. Rocklin was first recognized as a destination on the transcontinental railroad in 1864, about the same time granite mining began. By 1910, 22 quarries were operating and shipping nearly 2,000 carloads of granite. Rocklin granite was used to build the state capitol and many buildings in San Francisco.

In 1908, Southern Pacific announced that the railyards would be moved to Roseville, causing many residents to abandon their homes and follow the company. The granite industry also declined precipitously. The citizens persisted by starting small businesses, granite operations, agriculture, and a friendly, communal environment until the 1950s, when signs of growth began again. The construction of Highway 80 beginning in 1958 began to expand the City's potential for development. The Rocklin Sierra College campus was completed in 1961, and suburban expansion led to growth in the housing market during the late 1950s and 1960s.

Rocklin realized the benefits of a low cost of living and land that drew high technology firms and other industries to the region. This resulted in an expansion of commercial and residential development, including Stanford Ranch, a 3,000 acre planned community. By 2016, it was the fourth-fastest growing city in California. In 2016, the city completed an $11.3 million interchange at Highway 65 and Whitney Ranch Parkway, providing increased access to nearly 200 acres for development.

Abundant parks, trails, and open space make Rocklin that much more enjoyable. The City protects its natural resources and recently completed the purchase of approximately 184 acres of land that was previously the site of the Rocklin Golf Club. This green space at the heart of the city will provide an oasis for outdoor activities and opportunities for expansion of recreation, parks and trails systems.

I am excited to celebrate Rocklin's 125th Anniversary, and look forward to the continued successes of the city.

COMMENDING JAY SORENSEN

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend Jay Sorensen upon his induction into the California Outdoors Hall of Fame. This honor is a testament to his dedication in working to promote conservation. As a lifelong fishing lover, his tireless advocacy for the Delta has not only inspired thousands of others to take part in the great outdoors, but has also helped preserve the Delta's waters and wildlife for future generations to appreciate. This incredible commitment to our region and to conservation merits our highest distinction.

On behalf of the people of California's 3rd Congressional District, I offer my sincere congratulations as well as my best wishes for the years ahead.

THE FIGHT TO DEFEAT MALARIA

HON. JAMIE RASKIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of U.S. leadership to end malaria globally, a movement driven by the President's Malaria Initiative and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. These benchmark programs have helped save the lives of seven million people from this devastating disease for nearly two decades. I am proud to represent the 8th District of Maryland, where many of the major life-saving scientific discoveries have occurred, notably at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research and the National Institutes of Health.

As a leader in the fight to eliminate malaria, the U.S. has helped create and advance life-saving interventions like insecticide-treated bed nets, indoor residual spray, and rapid diagnostic tests throughout endemic regions including Sub-Saharan Africa, South America, and Southeast Asia. Between 2000 and 2015, the U.S. and our global partners have driven down malaria death rates by 62 percent overall, and by 69 percent for children under five. Yet, despite this progress, more work remains: the World Health Organization (WHO) reported 445,000 deaths in 2016 caused by this preventable and treatable disease.

In its World Malaria Report of 2017, the WHO highlighted the successes and shortcomings of the global community's efforts to combat this disease, which is still killing hundreds of thousands of people every year. While annual reports have noted steady declines in deaths and infections caused by malaria, progress has stalled due to insecticide and drug resistance, stagnant funding from global and domestic partners, and political instability. For the first time since 2000, when the global community first came together to end malaria, infection rates increased and death rates did not decline. This is the stark reality of the fight against malaria: when attention and funding shrink, the disease thrives and spreads.

I urge my colleagues to join me in continuing our bipartisan commitment to defeating malaria, including full funding of the President's Malaria Initiative and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. Together, we can ensure that a day will arrive when no child will ever again die from a mosquito bite.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEMORIAL BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th Anniversary of Memorial Baptist Church, located in the city of Baytown in East Harris County.

This area was mainly a farming and ranching community known as Goose Creek, until oil was found there in 1907 and it quickly became a rowdy and untidy camp. In 1918, Reverend J. W. Anderson felt that God was calling him to organize a church in Goose Creek. At this time a group of Christian women held a prayer meeting in their homes and the First Baptist Church of Goose Creek was organized with eight members. Reverend Anderson was named the pastor and the first building was built. In 1927, the church had grown to 614 members and Reverend J. D. Fuller became the new pastor. Due to their increased size, the congregation needed a larger building. This building cost $50,000 and they had a hard time making payments during the depression. On December 7, 1945, the cities of Pelly annexed Goose Creek and Baytown. At this time, the church changed its name to Memorial Baptist Church and built a new sanctuary on Sterling Street.

In 2008 Memorial Church and Trinity Baptist Church voted to donate their church buildings on Highway 146 to Memorial. This new area became the North Campus of Memorial Baptist Church and Reverend Andrew McDaniel was named pastor. On 25 August 2017, Hurricane Harvey came ashore in Texas. It flooded Baytown and other areas along the coast. Memorial Baptist Church's gym was used as a shelter for over 180 people. A deacon of the church named Robby Davis along with a team of other church members helped to clean out homes to be repaired. They moved furniture, cabinets, flooring and sheet rock. Some people did day labor, furnished food, washed clothes and provided places for victims of the storm to stay. Memorial North Campus was also flooded and on November 4, 2017, they were able to worship at that location again.

On 25 February 2018, this church will celebrate being a century old. God has used Memorial Baptist Church as an amazing witness for 100 years and I am privileged to have such a place of worship in my district.

RECOGNIZING KEVIN McALEENAN

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kevin McAleenan, Acting Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP): Mr. McAleenan has been chosen as the United States' honoree for the prestigious League of United Latin American Citizens Council No. 12 (LULAC) Señor Internacional award.

Following his graduation with a Bachelor of Arts from Amherst College, Mr. McAleenan earned a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Chicago Law School. Thereafter, he worked at a private law firm in California. However, he was motivated to work in public service after the events of September 11, 2001. He joined the Office of Anti-Terrorism at U.S. Customs Service, a legacy organization of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, where he was eventually named as the Director.

Mr. McAleenan became Acting Commissioner of CBP on January 20th, 2017. Prior to his role as Acting Commissioner, Mr. McAleenan held several leadership positions with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including Deputy Commissioner of CBP and Assistant Commissioner at the Office of Field Operations. Upon Mr. McAleenan's appointment to Deputy Commissioner, former CBP Commissioner R. Gil Kerlikowske spoke of McAleenan highly, saying, "His dedication, his vision to transform CBP and to ensure that we remain the nation's premier law enforcement agency, is truly astounding."

Throughout his career, Mr. McAleenan worked to increase security at the border, improved terrorism detection and response tactics, and supervised the trade and travel at over 300 domestic ports of entry. In his current role, he has three core missions: counterterrorism, border security, and trade enforcement. Mr. McAleenan oversees 60,000 employees and directs the largest law-enforcement agency in the federal government. For his work, Mr. McAleenan received the Service to America Medal, Call to Service Award, and in 2015, he was honored with a Presidential Rank Award, the nation's highest civil service award.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Mr. Kevin McAleenan. I congratulate him on receiving the prestigious LULAC No. 12 Señor Internacional award.

SAN ANTONIO'S TERCENTENNIAL YEAR—1718

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the City of San Antonio and its residents on the 300th anniversary of the city's founding. San Antonio has grown from a small farming community along the banks of the San Antonio River into the 7th largest city in the United States.

Its rich history and vibrant culture is what makes it truly unique. The first flag to fly over Texas was the Spanish flag. Spain laid official claim to what is now parts of Texas from 1716 to 1821, as part of the Viceroyalty of New Spain, or Colonial Mexico. On May 1, 1718, the Mission San Antonio de Valero—later known as the Alamo—was established.

The Tejanos' place in Texas history took root in the 1700s when the land was under Spanish rule. A group of mostly Spanish-Indians loyal to the Spanish crown pushed their colonial empire north from Mexico to found a military post and religious missions to establish San Antonio. As frontier people, they were mainly ranchers and farmers and developed a culture unique to them. Settling northeastern Mexico, the area of modem day San Antonio, many of their customs reflected that of traditional Mexican heritage, but with an independent Texas twist.

San Antonio is home to five missions established along the San Antonio River in the 1700s by Catholic missionaries. The five missions are all but three miles apart from each other: Mission San Antonio de Valero (The Alamo), Mission Concepcion, Mission San Jose, Mission San Juan, and Mission Espada. The missions served to make the American Indians into Spanish citizens. By entering the missions, the Indians pledged to follow the rules of Spain. They set aside their traditional life to learn a new language, accept a new religion and pledge allegiance to a new king.

Today the missions represent a connection with our past. The missions depict classic Spanish architecture, domes and bell towers, and sanctuaries that still have active parishes and cultural centers. The missions are a part of every Texan's history.

Military Plaza was first established in 1722 as a parade ground and market square for the Spanish troops stationed there. Today, the only noticeable evidence of the Spanish troops marching and living in the plaza is the Spanish Governor's Palace. The area has been the heart of the city and today is the commercial and government center of San Antonio.

Any Texan will tell you that water is very important to our state, and water is what contributed to San Antonio's rich history. The San Antonio River comes from the Edwards Aquifer Spring Field north of downtown San Antonio. With this natural resource, the missions and plaza were located close by. It provided a clean reliable source to the missionaries and soldiers.

The river supported agricultural operations at the missions through an irrigation system created by the early settlers. Portions of this water system remain used today, 300 years later.

Over the years, the Tejanos prospered and furthered their distinction from the Spanish crown and from other parts of Mexico. A failed attempt by the Tejanos against Spanish rule gained new hope when Mexico won independence from Spain in 1831.

By this time Texas had seen a significant influx of settlers from the United States, and like the Tejanos, had a culture unique as the land it occupied. As Texas' distinction from Mexico grew, so did the desire for local rule and sovereignty.

The passion for independence spread throughout Texas and San Antonio and on March 2, 1836, 54 delegates signed the Texas Declaration of Independence and the fight for freedom began. 187 freedom fighters started assembling in an old beat-up mission in San Antonio.

Juan Seguín and his company of Tejanos rode into the Alamo and readied for battle alongside William Barrett Travis, Jim Bowie and Davy Crockett. This rag-tag group of relentless patriots, made up of men from nearly every state in the Union and 13 foreign countries, including Mexico, readied for one of the most storied battles in our history.

Outnumbered by an overwhelming Mexican army, these Texas warriors knew that surrender was not an option. Retreat was never on the table. Victory or death.

On February 23, 1836, Santa Ana's army of 1500 well-armed troops unleashed on the defenders of the Alamo. During the siege, Travis sent out his famous call for reinforcements.

Juan Seguín was the last messenger to leave, riding through enemy lines carrying the final message from the beleaguered mission. Unfortunately, the call for help was not answered in time. Travis and 187 volunteers sacrificed their lives on the altar of freedom after thirteen glorious days at the Alamo.

Regrouping in Gonzales, Seguín and his company of Tejanos joined General Sam Houston in the final battle for independence along the marshy banks of the San Jacinto River. This was the only Tejano unit at San Jacinto. As not to confuse the Tejanos with Santa Anna's army, General Sam had Seguín put a playing card in the head band of each Tejano so they could easily be recognized. In an impromptu siege on the sleeping enemy, General Sam and his boys routed the Mexican Army yelling, ''Remember the Alamo!'' ''Remember Goliad!'' Most of the enemy were killed or wounded. The rest were captured or disappeared, the victory was stunning.

Texas became a free, independent nation that day and claimed what is now Texas and parts of New Mexico, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado and Wyoming. In June of 1836, Juan Seguín accepted the official Mexican surrender of San Antonio and later saw that the remains of those that perished at the Alamo received an honorable burial.

A plaque on the Alamo wall states: ''The Alamo: The Thermopylae of Texas.'' The Alamo is a tribute to all those that are defiant against any form of tyranny. It is important for us to recognize all those that sacrificed for freedom, yesterday, today and tomorrow. Remember who we are and what we stand for—remember the Alamo.

Whether it is the river walk, historic missions, floating parades, amazing food or the Alamo that you love about going to San Antonio; there is something for everyone of every age. This year as San Antonio celebrates 300 years of history, I encourage everyone, whether you're a longtime Texan or a transplant, to take the time and learn something new about San Antonio's unique and fascinating history. Three centuries later, that same dogged determination that filled that little Spanish mission is what continues to set Texas apart from all the rest.

And that's just the way it is.

INTRODUCTION OF SENSIBLE ENFORCEMENT OF CANNABIS ACT

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, in January, the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) rescinded the Cole Memorandum, a directive which has provided a framework for states to pursue reasonable regulation of cannabis. DOJ's ill-conceived decision adversely affects states, including the State of California, that have in ''good faith'' implemented regulatory frameworks, relying on the memo.

In November 2016, the people of California spoke up and voted in favor of Proposition 64, which legalized recreational cannabis, joining seven states in our nation in making recreational cannabis legal. Currently, those laws are being implemented. The recent action by the Attorney General puts the industry in jeopardy.

The State of California has the sixth largest economy in the world and accounts for almost 15 percent of our nation's Gross Domestic Product. Given the implementation of tax reform and elimination of State and Local Tax deductions in the coming year, coupled with our limited federal budget due to sequestration, California and other states will experience funding shortfalls that need to be addressed. The economic constraints being placed on California will slow down our economy, but marijuana sales taxes will help provide stability and be a mechanism used to fill the funding gaps. By 2020, marijuana sales taxes are estimated to potentially reach $1 billion annually in revenue for California.

To date, eight states have legalized recreational cannabis and twenty-nine states and the District of Columbia—which represent more than half of the American population—have enacted legislation to permit the use of medical marijuana. The repeal of the Cole Memo contravenes the will of the American public. Furthermore, this decision will negatively affect numerous Americans who utilize marijuana for medical purposes.

Therefore, I am introducing the bipartisan Sensible Enforcement of Cannabis Act with Representative GAETZ. This legislation will prohibit the Attorney General from prosecuting individuals for any conduct that concerns medicinal cannabis or recreational use of cannabis in states that have authorized cannabis laws. The bill would also include exceptions in which the Attorney General would be able to prosecute such cases involving the distribution of cannabis to minors, among others.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JIM DEGOOD

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Jim DeGood who passed away peacefully on January 22, 2018 in Niles, Ohio. I can't really speak of Jim without speaking of Nancy in the same breath. They were partners in every sense of the word. And they were a force for me when I first started running for political office. I am forever indebted to them for helping launch my career.

Jim was born on May 7, 1935 in Marysville, Ohio to Max and Marjory Schoenleb DeGood. He was the oldest of four children. Jim was a 1953 graduate of Marysville High School where he was an honors student, president of student council, and recipient of nine varsity letters in three different sports. He continued his education at The Ohio State University earning a Bachelor's of Science Degree in Business Administration in 1953.

He began his career with the underwriting division of the Glens Falls Insurance Company at their Columbus office later becoming the manager of that department. In 1967, he moved to Warren, Ohio and joined the Gamble Insurance Agency. Some years later, Jim and his partners purchased The Gamble Agency. It continued to operate in Howland as the Gibson-DeGood Insurance Agency until Jim retired. Jim was also a member of the Independent Insurance Agents Association of Trumbull County being the treasurer of that organization for over 25 years.

Outside of work, Jim was a member of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish in Niles, Ohio. Additionally, he was an active participant in various business and social organization in the community, including The Chamber, Kiwanis, YMCA, TAG, Butler Art, The Buckeye Club, Trumbull County Club, Ohio State Faculty Club, and the Ohio State Alumni Association. Jim also enjoyed spending time with his family and friends. He enjoyed traveling, cooking, and taking care of his home. Above all, he was an avid sports fan of the Indians, the Browns, and the Cavs. One of the highlights of his life was a visit to Augusta National Golf Course to witness the play of the Masters Golf Tournament. He especially enjoyed watching Ohio State Football games. He was a season ticket holder for 48 years, following the Buckeyes to several bowl games across the country.

He will be truly missed by his wife Nancy Vennitti DeGood, the love of his life; his son, Douglas DeGood of Charleston, South Carolina; his daughter Terri Pytlik of Warren; his brother Jerry DeGood and his wife Mary of Brookville, Florida; and by so many others who had the pleasure of knowing Jim. I extend my deepest and sincerest condolences.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FRESH START ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the release of President Trump's outrageous budget that slashes funding for programs that help reduce crime and reduce recidivism, I rise in support of the Fresh Start Act, a bill I reintroduced earlier today that will bring positive reform to our criminal justice system.

If enacted, the Fresh Start Act would allow certain individuals who have been convicted of nonviolent offenses, have paid their debt to society, and are now law-abiding members of the community to petition courts to have their nonviolent conviction expunged from their records.

A criminal record, even for a minor, nonviolent offense, can pose as a barrier to employment, education and housing opportunities—the very things necessary to start one's life over.

This is not only bad for rehabilitated offenders, it is bad for their families and for the communities in which they live.

The Fresh Start Act would give nonviolent offenders a chance to start over again, a chance to become productive members of society.

The bill allows offenders to apply for expungement to the court where they were sentenced and allows the United States Attorney for that District to submit recommendations to the court. Applicants who are denied could reapply once every two years. Once seven years have elapsed since an offender has completed their sentence, expungement would be automatically granted. However, sex offenders and those who commit crimes causing a loss of over $25,000 would not be eligible for automatic expungement.

Finally, the bill would also encourage states to pass their own expungement laws for state offenses. States that pass a substantially similar law would receive a 5 percent increase in their Byrne funding while those that do not would lose 5 percent of their Byrne funds.

It is one thing to convict someone of a nonviolent crime. It is quite another to condemn him to a de facto life sentence for it.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING THE WEST SENECA YOUTH THEATRE AS COMMUNITY SERVICE ORGANIZATION OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the West Seneca Youth Theatre, as the West Seneca Chamber of Commerce names the group 2018 Community Service Organization of the Year during their annual Community Awards ceremony at Kloc's Grove.

The West Seneca Youth Theatre was founded in 2005 to give children ages 10 to 17 an opportunity to perform in a theatrical setting. Since its creation, the theatre has presented numerous productions of professional caliber, teaching children the value of hard work, friendship, and giving back to others.

In addition to performing at local schools, the West Seneca Youth Theatre has entertained at the Kiwanis Club's annual Christmas and Easter celebrations for adults with disabilities, and has visited and performed at assisted living and long-term-care facilities including the Garden Gate Health Care facility and Father Baker Manor.

A fixture in the community, the West Seneca Youth Theatre presents Christmas carols at the Southgate Plaza annually, and has frequently been invited to perform at Town of West Seneca-sponsored programs.

Outside of bringing entertainment and joy to many, the theatre troupe consistently gives back to the community. Following extensive flood damage in 2014 to the Lexington Green neighborhood, children in the theatre raised more than $9,000 for those affected. Each year, students and directors volunteer their time and expertise to West Middle School productions, as well as loaning out set pieces and costumes to various school productions in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to recognize the West Seneca Youth Theatre. I congratulate the West Seneca Youth Theatre as the recipient of the 2018 Community Service Organization of the Year award and wish them continued success in all their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING MR. ZACHARY LOOK

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Mr. Zachary Look, who is interning in my office with the Uni-Capitol Washington Program. The Uni-Capitol Washington Program (UCWIP) has paired some of the brightest Australian students with various congressional offices for almost two decades and I am happy to be a host again this year. Zac comes to us from Griffith University in Queensland and is currently pursuing a degree in government and international relations. Over the past month, I have found him to be outstanding in his duties and he has gone above and beyond our expectations. He has attended committee hearings, drafted constituent correspondence, and assisted me as well as my staff with research. His Australian accent has garnered the attention of many of my constituents on tours and over the phone. Zac's commitment, hard work, and presence have been an asset to the office.

The program has been in force for 19 years thanks to the vision of Eric Federing, its director and founder. The students who are selected come from a variety of academic disciplines, but all have a common interest: promoting the U.S.-Australia relationship. These student placements are enhanced by the formation of genuine friendships and the exchange of views and ideas between the Australian interns and their respective offices. We are grateful for these friendships and it is our hope that they strengthen the diplomatic ties of our great countries.

I would like to thank Eric Federing for the opportunity to host Zac over the past several weeks. To date, over 210 interns have come through his program representing nine different universities. It enhances opportunities for the individuals who come and enlighten those who they come to. After the internship, many receive jobs on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C. or go to work with Federal or various State Parliaments in Australia. Other interns have gone on to work in the Australian Embassy or The World Bank. Simply put, this program selects incredibly talented individuals that are a pleasure to host and work with. It was an honor to have Zac in our office, and I wish him the very best in the future. I thank Zac for his hard work and dedication.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE GENOA HIGH SCHOOL WRESTLING TEAM FOR WINNING THE OHSAA STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Genoa High School Comets for winning the Ohio School Athletic Association Division III Team Wrestling Championship. This title was the first team state championship of any kind in the school's history.

Having placed runner-up at last year's championships, the number one seeded Comets defeated Massillon Tuslaw 40–20 in the final to secure the state title and cap off an undefeated season.

These student-athletes gave it their all, and their community should be proud of them. Wrestling is a technical sport that requires attention to detail, endurance, and toughness. It's a testament to the dedication and hard work of the Genoa team and the coaching staff that they were able to achieve this success.

Once again, congratulations to Coach Bob Bergman and the Comets on the state championship. Great job Genoa wrestling.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STATE INSURANCE REGULATION PRESERVATION ACT

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, together with my colleague Representative BEATTY, I am pleased to introduce today the State Insurance Regulation Preservation Act. This legislation will ensure that the regulation of insurance savings and loan holding companies reflects our state system of insurance regulation while protecting policyholders and depositors.

The Dodd-Frank Act brought insurance savings and loan holding companies under Federal Reserve Supervision for the first time. As such, these insurance companies are currently regulated by both the states, and the Federal Reserve. Consistent with the Dodd-Frank Act's reaffirmation that insurance should be regulated by the states, our legislation remedies the current structural inefficiency by allowing the Federal Reserve to ensure that the holding company is well capitalized, while leaving the day-to-day regulation to the states.

The bill accomplishes this providing that insurance savings and loan holding companies that meet state and federal capital standards are regulated day-to-day by the states. The Federal Reserve would remain the backstop regulator for these companies and would retain the ability to step in if capital levels were insufficient, and also would retain general emergency authority to step as the day-to-day regulator. The thrifts in these companies would continue to be regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and Federal Reserve would retain the ability to examine material subsidiaries.

This legislation is important and helpful because Dodd-Frank did not provide specific instructions on how the Federal Reserve supervision should complement state insurance supervision for companies that are subject to both. We believe this legislation would create greater regulatory efficiency, without constraining the Federal Reserve's ability to fulfill its statutory mandate to protect the safety and soundness of these institutions.

As we developed this bill, both members of Congress and regulators identified potential improvements to ensure that the objectives of this bill are met. In particular, we are committed to preventing gaps in regulation, and ensuring that the Federal Reserve has adequate information and authority to step in when needed. Our objective is to pass a bill that embodies sound public policy and enjoys broad bipartisan support. We look forward to continued dialogue and hope our colleagues can support this needed legislation.

HONORING THE RETURN OF SAM JOHNSON AND THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF OPERATION HOMECOMING

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the 45th anniversary of my friend and hero, Congressman SAM JOHNSON, returning home from his imprisonment in a North Vietnamese prison camp during the Vietnam War. Operation Homecoming, which occurred from February through April in 1973, returned 591 American prisoners of war held during the Vietnam War.

During SAM's tenure of nearly three decades in the United States Air Force, he unfortunately spent nearly seven years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam. During his time in captivity, SAM endured various forms of torture, designed to break his will. His continuous defiance caused his Vietnamese captors to place Congressman JOHNSON in a notoriously cruel prisoner of war camp, nicknamed the ''Hanoi Hilton.'' Even after being subjected to 42 months of solitary confinement and repeatedly tortured, SAM never let his captors defeat his resistant spirit and will. On February 17, 1973, SAM was able to return home to Texas, where he was greeted by his family.

Colonel JOHNSON retired after 29–years in the United States Air Force, serving as a director of the Air Force Fighter Weapons School, a commander of the 31st Tactical Fighter Wing at Homestead Air Reserve Base, a commander with an air division out of Holloman Air Force Base, and a pilot in the Air Force Thunderbirds. Flying over 62 combat missions and being a combat veteran of both the Vietnam and Korean Wars, SAM encapsulates patriotism and dedication to his country. For his service, SAM was awarded two Silver Stars, two Legions of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and a Bronze Star, among other well-earned awards.

It is a privilege and an honor to serve alongside one of my personal heroes and true friends. We first served together in the Texas State Legislature from 1987 until 1991, when Congressman JOHNSON was elected to represent Texas' 3rd Congressional District. Since being elected in 2005 for the 24th District of Texas, I have been fortunate to continue to serve alongside SAM not only in the House of Representatives, but on the Ways and Means Committee as well. My esteemed colleague epitomizes service and dedication to our country, with a full and accomplished career of public service after serving valiantly in our military.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize the 45th anniversary of Congressman SAM JOHNSON's release, and congratulate him on his lifetime of service. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the anniversary of SAM's return to the United States; and in remembering this anniversary, we also remember all of those captured and imprisoned defending our liberty and freedom.

HONORING WENDY PIASECKI AS EDUCATOR OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mrs. Wendy Piasecki as she is presented with the 2018 Educator of the Year award by the West Seneca Chamber of Commerce at Kloc's Grove. Mrs. Pasiecki exemplifies dedication as an educator, and West Seneca is fortunate to benefit from her talents.

Forty years ago, Mrs. Piasecki began her career by earning her Master of Music degree in composition theory. At age 40, Mrs. Piasecki boldly decided to go back to school and attain a teaching certificate.

Mrs. Piasecki devoted her career to music education in and outside of schools. In her two decades plus in the West Seneca Central School District, Mrs. Piasecki has taught music education and theater at nearly every grade level and at every school. She has tutored students outside of school in music theory and piano. Outside of the classroom, Mrs. Pasiecki has helped students in extracurricular activities, such as preparing for the Erie County Music Educators Association Music Festival, chaperoning students' trips to the Young People's concert at Fantasy Island, directing musicals, and even presenting student performers at the Junior Musical Theater Celebration at Shea's Theater, one of Buffalo's finest performance venues.

Educators like Mrs. Piasecki, who invest themselves in the children and our community, are part of what makes Western New York such a special place. Because of her dedication, parents can rest assured that their kids will be attending school in a supportive environment that allows them to explore their creative sides while receiving a first-rate education.

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to honor Mrs. Wendy Piasecki as she receives the West Seneca Chamber of Commerce's 2018 Educator of the Year award. Her personal devotion to teaching serves as a model for future educators and an inspiration to all of us who believe in public service.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MRS. LOVEY ANNA LEAVELL

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the generous, path-breaking life of Mrs. Lovey Anna Leavell of Sandusky, Ohio. Lovey passed from this life on Saturday, January 22, 2018 after a short illness. She will be truly missed by her family and friends. Lovey was indefatigable.

Lovey's involvement and commitment to her hometown of Sandusky was known by everyone in the area. Her life of service to her community started at the historic Second Baptist Church where she served as Church Secretary, Choir Director, teacher, and Sunday school superintendent. It is also here where she would meet her husband of 60 plus years, Daniel Leavell.

Once her children became school age and began to attend Sandusky City Schools she became active in the school system as well. When her children were young she worked for the school district as a teacher's aide, bus driver, and served as the Treasurer for the Sandusky Band Parents Association. Her dedication to the Sandusky City schools continued always. Even after her children graduated, she continued her connection to the school by working as a substitute teacher.

Civil rights was a cause that Lovey was committed to as well. As a lifetime member of the Sandusky NAACP, she worked on a number of committees for her local branch. She would help set up meetings at which local politicians would be able to talk about issues dealing not only with civil rights, but also other important issues that impacted the community. Her commitment to civil rights was one of the main reasons she decided to become a realtor. Throughout her life she saw the damage that was being done to minorities due to the effects of redlining. It was her commitment to civil rights that made her want to become a realtor in order to help people obtain the American dream of home ownership.

Lovey Leavell was on a first name basis with every elected official that represented the city of Sandusky, from local up through the federal level. It was not uncommon for politicians and candidates to call her and her husband Dan for advice. She was a lifelong Democrat, her views on politics were perhaps best described by Sandusky Mayor Dennis Murray when he said this about Lovey, ''She was never about the games of partisanship. She believed totally in people and in the core things that Democrats stand for—equality, opportunity and good government.''

Later in life when most people would decide to relax and enjoy their retirement years, Lovey decided it was time for her to get a college degree. She received two degrees, associates and then bachelors, both from BGSU Firelands. Her time at Firelands was filled not only with classwork but also with trips to the United Nations in New York, involvement with student government, and several other groups. The students there would come to know her as ''Grandma Lovey''. During her time there she made such an impression on the students, staff, and faculty she was awarded the Links to Progress Award, the highest honor any person can receive from BGSU Firelands.

During Lovey's final years she served on the Ohio 9th congressional military academy nomination committee in 2015 and 2016. She continued her service on the James McBride Arboretum at BGSU Firelands. She never stopped being a realtor or working for civil rights with the NAACP. Even with her impressive life accomplishments, there was one thing Lovey felt she was missing: a Sandusky High School diploma. It was something she had wanted for more than half a century. In September of 2017 the Sandusky School Board presented her with an honorary high school diploma for her life time commitment to education and her involvement in the community.

Lovey is survived by her husband Dan, children Dan Jr., Doug and Deanna, a number of grandchildren, family, and friends. We offer them our prayers and hope that they comfort in the wonderful memories of this extraordinary woman, our dear friend Lovey. She will

be remembered with affection and gratitude for a lifetime dedicated so affectionately to making our part of the world a fairer and more loving place in which to live.

HONORING MR. LERONE BENNET, JR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a remarkable public servant and hometown hero, Mr. Lerone Bennet, Jr.

Mr. Bennet was a native of Clarksdale, Mississippi, and was an editor at Ebony Magazine during the time the publication published the photos of Emmett Till. In addition, he was also a journalist, author, and historian. A friend and Morehouse College classmate of Rev. Dr. Martin L. King, Jr., Mr. Bennet worked tirelessly in the struggle for Civil Rights. In 1994, Mr. Bennet was appointed to President Clinton's Committee on Arts and Humanities. He also served as an early adviser on the development of the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture.

During the last years of his life, Mr. Bennet suffered from vascular dementia. Last night, at 89-years-old, he passed away.

Today, we honor the life of Mr. Lerone Bennet, Jr. and his family.

HONORING ANGELO NERO

HON. JOHN J. FASO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and honor that I rise today to recognize the retirement of Columbia County Coroner, Angelo Nero.

Mr. Nero retired January 1 of this year, after dedicating over forty years of his life as Columbia County Coroner. He is remembered for his professional, compassionate, and timely service during his career.

Angelo provided exceptional service to the people of Columbia County, while maintaining a professional relationship with local law enforcement and first responders. His colleagues knew they could always depend on Angelo to respond to phone calls at all hours of the night.

During his career, Angelo served as Valatie village trustee and mayor for ten years. Prior to his service at the local level, he served in our Armed Forces during the Korean conflict.

Angelo's selfless service to Columbia County and our nation is greatly appreciated, and I wish him and his wife Barbara the best in their next adventure.

SERBIA AND THE USA

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor for me to talk about the great relationship we have with Serbia as co-chair of the Congressional Serbia Caucus along with EMANUEL CLEAVER of MO.

Serbia is a great friend of the United States.

As a Texan, I have great admiration for the people of Serbia. Our strong opinions and habit to speak our minds make us natural allies.

In fact, one of the first people to settle Texas was a Serbian named Dorde Sagic, or George Fischer as he was known in the U.S.

After settling in Texas, Sagic went on to become a justice of the peace in my hometown of Houston.

But Serbia has contributed much more to the cause of justice than just Mr. Sagic keeping the early streets of Houston safe.

Today we honor the service of Serbia's armed forces who have fought side-by-side with Americans to preserve justice during history's most horrific conflicts.

In 1918, President Woodrow Wilson gave a speech marking the fourth anniversary of Austria-Hungary's invasion of Serbia. Speaking of the bravery of the Serbian armed forces, President Wilson said:

''Nobly did they respond. So valiantly and courageous did they oppose the forces of a country ten times greater in population and resources . . . While their territory has been devastated and their homes despoiled, the spirit of the Serbian people has not been broken.''

As a Texan, I admire such defiance against overwhelming odds.

Like President Wilson, I am proud to share the stories of Serbia's bravery here in Washington.

I believe the most meaningful for Americans is the story of the Halyard Mission during the dark days of the Second World War.

While under Nazi-occupation, the Serbian people demonstrated their bravery as they played a crucial role in the largest rescue operation of American airmen in history.

In 1944, American bombers were flying frequent missions to strike Germany's vital oil supplies in Romania as part of the allied advance into Europe.

The 15th Air Force led this effort by launching nearly 20,000 sorties into Eastern Europe, with many of the missions flying over Nazi-occupied Yugoslavia. As many as 1,500 pilots and airmen were shot down during these courageous air raids.

Serbians, who had been resisting German forces since 1941, risked their own lives to rescue American aircrews and hide them from patrolling Nazis.

For months these brave and noble Serbians cared for and protected American and allied pilots.

By August 1944, the Allied forces, including the 15th Air Force and Office of Strategic Services, devised a daring operation to evacuate the hundreds of Allied pilots being sheltered by the Serbian resistance.

American aircraft flew into enemy territory and evacuated these airmen from an air field built and protected by local Serbians near the village of Pranjani.

For over 60 years this operation was kept secret. But now we can remember the courage of our Serbian friends and say thank you.

The spirit of the Halyard mission still lives on today as a remarkable story of resistance and heroism.

As was the case in both World Wars, Serbia and the U.S. still face shared threats.

About 600 foreign fighters in Syria have come from the Balkan states. ISIS and al-Qaeda terrorists present a threat to Serbia and the region just as they present a threat to the U.S.

We must continue coordinating with our Serbian partners to stop returning terrorists and neutralize networks that recruit fighters in the Balkans.

The U.S. is also working with Serbia to improve its independent judiciary and fight corruption. A democratic Serbia with a strong rule of law is in America's interests.

But there are others who do not support this goal.

Russian disinformation efforts are designed to keep Serbia in its sphere of influence and poison our warming friendship.

Nevertheless, Serbia's integration to the West has continued to move forward.

In 2006, Serbia joined NATO's Partnership for Peace program and, in 2015, signed an Individual Partnership Action Plan with the alliance to strengthen cooperation.

Recently the European Union announced that Serbia could join the EU as early as 2025. I applaud this step which will strengthen Belgrade's political institutions and economic ties with the West.

Together we share the same dreams of a bright and free future for both our countries.

We are blessed to have brave men and women that ensure our futures are bright and free.

Thanks to the Serbian armed forces for standing with America in the wars of the past and in the challenges we will face together in the future.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING CORA BEASLEY

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, when tragedy struck in 1957, the Surry County, North Carolina community came together, honored its' own, and remained strong.

I rise to commemorate the selfless sacrifice of Mrs. Cora Beasley, a third grade teacher. Sixty-one years ago, a fire consumed Flat Rock Elementary School in Surry County. Mrs. Beasley ignored the danger and helped students out of a second-floor window, saving their lives.

During the blaze, Mrs. Beasley attempted also to save third-grader Larry Adams, but sadly, they both perished. This month, the Flat Rock School community will rename its main building the Cora F. Beasley Building, a fitting tribute to one woman's selfless heroism.

I salute the efforts of this tight-knit community and offer my prayers for Mrs. Beasley, Mr. Adams, their families and all of those affected by the fire that day.

RECOGNIZING AL-ROSS SCREEN PRINTING AND EMBROIDERY AS BUSINESS OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Al-Ross Screen Printing & Embroidery as the West Seneca Chamber of Commerce's choice for the 2018 Business of the Year Award on Thursday, February 15th at Kloc's Grove.

For 45 years, Al-Ross has provided embroiders and screen print clothing and apparel for the Western New York area. Through their talented work, Al-Ross allows people and organizations of all sorts a sense of identity, professionalism and an unforgettable local brand.

Along with Al-Ross's strong business sense comes an equally strong sense of community and giving back. Following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Al-Ross raised and donated more than $20,000. Locally, the business founded and supported the Athlete of the Month Club in West Seneca schools, giving students athletes t-shirts promoting their achievements. Al-Ross consistently donates to basket raffles and fundraisers for schools, clubs, churches, benefits, and charities.

Embodying community spirit, when the Buffalo Bills made the NFL playoffs for the first time in seventeen years, Al-Ross rose to the challenge and quickly created customized shirts for fans. The Seneca Street fixture saw lines out the door as excited Western New Yorkers rushed to support their team and their business.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to honor Al-Ross Screen Printing & Embroidery as they receive the 2018 Business of the Year Award from the West Seneca Chamber of Commerce. The contributions to our community made by this business are commendable, and I wish them much continued success in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING ILDEFONSO GUAJARDO VILLARREAL

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Secretary of the Economy of Mexico, Ildefonso Guajardo Villarreal. Mr. Guajardo has been chosen as Mexico's honoree for the prestigious League of United Latin American Citizens Council No. 12 (LULAC) Señor Internacional award.

Mr. Guajardo, a Mexican economist and public servant, was born April 19, 1957 in Monterey, Nuevo León. He received his Bachelor's degree in Economics from the Autonomous University of Nuevo León. Subsequently, Mr. Guajardo pursued graduate studies in Economics at Arizona State University and the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Guajardo began his long and successful career in the 1980s. He would hold several important positions, including Economist at the International Monetary Fund, Director of the North American Free Trade Agreement Affairs Office, and Chief Clerk at the Foreign Affairs Ministry. He would later serve in Nuevo León as head of the Governor's Executive Office and soon after, Mr. Guajardo would be elected as a congressman. In 2012, Mr. Guajardo assumed the office of Secretary of the Economy of Mexico, appointed by President Enrique Peña Nieto. He is currently negotiating the ongoing North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between Mexico, the United States, and Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Mr. Guajardo's accomplishments and tireless service to Mexico. I congratulate him on receiving the prestigious LULAC No. 12 Señor Internacional award. His dedication to others has had a very significant impact on the lives of many citizens in Mexico and the United States.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FACILITATING VETERANS' EDUCATION ACT

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense provides exceptional training and experiences to our nation's servicemembers. For each occupation in the military, servicemembers undergo a series of formal military training courses.

For years, the American Council on Education (ACE) has evaluated that training and related experiences to provide colleges and universities with guidelines and recommendations to consider when awarding credit for such training. For instance, ACE may recommend that colleges award one semester credit hour of first aid for a soldier who has taken basic combat training.

Since 2013, the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Coast Guard have produced the Joint Services Transcript (JST), an official documentation of a servicemember's military training and their corresponding ACE credit recommendations. The JST allows veterans to earn college credit for their military service, helping them attain a college degree sooner.

While the document is available through an online portal, there are reports of servicemembers leaving the military unaware of the JST.

Therefore, I am introducing the bipartisan Facilitating Veterans' Education Act, which directs the Department of Defense to issue the Joint Services Transcript to servicemembers separating from the Armed Forces.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE WAUSEON HIGH SCHOOL WRESTLING TEAM FOR WINNING THE OHIO STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Ohio High School Athletic Association Division II Team Wrestling State Champion Wauseon Indians. After finishing runner up in 2016 and 2017, Wauseon topped Mentor Lake Catholic in the championship to capture the first team title of any sport in school history.

Wauseon has a rich tradition in wrestling, winning the Northwest Ohio Athletic League twelve times. Under the tutelage of coach Mike Ritter, Wauseon was able to win the title by first going through Washington Court House and Canfield High School on the way to the finals.

These student-athletes gave it their all, and the Wauseon community should be proud of them. Wrestling tests the mettle of its competitors, and it takes grit, determination, and toughness to compete at a high level. In addition to practice, student-athletes are asked to meet certain academic standards and exceed them as well. These competitors deserve our recognition.

Once again, congratulations to Coach Mike Ritter and the rest of the Wauseon wrestling team on a job well done.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. BILLY JOE WESTBROOK

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of World War II veteran and dear friend, Dr. Billy Joe Westbrook of Channelview, Texas. Dr. Westbrook went to be with the Lord on February 13, 2018 at the age of 91.

He was born on November 8, 1926 in a house three miles west of Electra, Texas. His parents were caring and hardworking people who instilled those same qualities in their sons. His long life was defined by determination and honor and like his parents, he worked hard and gave much.

He served in the U.S. Army during World War II as a medic, which led him to dentistry. He graduated from Midwestern University with a B.S. in Chemistry then earned a D.D.S from the University of Texas, graduating in the top 10 percent of his class.

During the Korean War he entered the Air Force as a dental officer. After serving honorably, B.J. opened a dental practice in Columbus, Texas then moved to the Northeast area of Houston where he became heavily involved in its civic, political, medical and educational communities. In 1958, he and a group of local businessmen founded the Rotary Club of North Shore, Houston, Texas. Their signature event, the Rotary Club Catfish Crawfish Boil currently raises over $300,000 annually.

B.J. was passionate about serving people above himself. He served on many state and collegiate boards and was president of the Harris County Fresh Water District 51 for fifty years. In recognition of his many contributions Westbrook Street, located in East Houston, was named after him. Though an avid hunter, fisherman, scuba diver and pilot, his first love was people. His vision, philanthropy and laughter made him an icon and hero to all who knew him.

B.J. was married to Rosalie Westbrook for sixty years until she passed away in 2007. Their middle daughter, Marcie, died in 2015. He is survived by his two daughters Reneé

and Mickie, two brothers Ken and Floyd Westbrook, and host of adoring nephews, nieces and friends.

My prayers are with the family and friends of Dr. Westbrook. He had a full life and will be missed.

RECOGNIZING SHELL FAB & DESIGN AS THE WEST SENECA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MEMBER OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 2018

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Shell Fab & Design as the West Seneca Chamber of Commerce's 2018 Chamber Member of the Year. For over a quarter of a century, Shell Fab & Design has characterized what it means to be a successful small business and active member of the community, donating to various important causes and charities while maintaining over forty full-time employees.

Shell Fab & Design has specialized in providing customers in the Western New York area with high quality residential and commercial surfacing work, cabinetry, and kitchen countertops. Because of its renowned service, Shell Fab & Design has gained a well-deserved reputation in the community as a leader in the stone countertop industry.

Along with consistently providing excellence in the custom and manufacturing aspects of the countertop business, Shell Fab & Design has kept ahead of the curve through innovation. It is this ability to keep up with the ever-changing nature of the economy while providing an exceptional level of quality that has allowed the business to thrive and expand.

Shell Fab & Design is as generous as it is successful. The business contributes to Queen of Heaven Parish, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the West Seneca Food Pantry, Habitat for Humanity, and breast cancer research. Frequently, they donate cutting board sets to school fundraisers, sports fundraisers, and other charitable causes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish again to recognize an exceptional business, Shell Fab & Design, and all that their employees do for West Seneca and the greater Western New York region. I congratulate Shell Fab & Design on their selection as the West Seneca Chamber of Commerce's 2018 Chamber Member of the Year and wish the business and its employees success in all future endeavors.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1131–S1192

Measures Introduced: Twenty bills and seven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2431–2450, and S. Res. 407–413. **Pages S1164–65**

Measures Reported:

H.R. 294, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the "Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building".

H.R. 452, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 1207, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 River Street in Tilden, Texas, as the "Tilden Veterans Post Office", with an amendment.

H.R. 1208, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9155 Schaefer Road, Converse, Texas, as the "Converse Veterans Post Office Building".

H.R. 1858, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office".

H.R. 1988, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the "Merle Haggard Post Office Building".

H.R. 2254, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the "Janet Capello Post Office Building".

H.R. 2302, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the "Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 2464, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office".

H.R. 2672, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Carter Street in Fairview, Illinois, as the "Sgt. Douglas J. Riney Post Office".

H.R. 2815, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the "Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office".

H.R. 2873, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 Glenside Avenue in Wyncote, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Peter Taub Post Office Building".

H.R. 3109, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the "Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building".

H.R. 3369, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 225 North Main Street in Spring Lake, North Carolina, as the "Howard B. Pate, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 3638, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Kings Road in Jacksonville, Florida, as the "Rutledge Pearson Post Office Building".

H.R. 3655, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Main Street in Belmar, New Jersey, as the "Dr. Walter S. McAfee Post Office Building".

H.R. 3821, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 Main Street in Clermont, Georgia, as the "Zach T. Addington Post Office".

H.R. 3893, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Mathe Avenue in Interlachen, Florida, as the "Robert H. Jenkins, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 4042, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the "Borinqueneers Post Office Building".

H.R. 4285, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 Bridgeton Pike in Mullica Hill, New Jersey, as the "James C. 'Billy' Johnson Post Office Building".

S. 931, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the "George Sakato Post Office".

S. 2040, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 621 Kansas Avenue in Atchison, Kansas, as the "Amelia Earhart Post Office Building". **Pages S1163–64**

Measures Passed:

Black History Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 413, celebrating Black History Month. **Page S1189**

Veterans Treatment Court Improvement Act: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 946, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S1190**

Alexander (for Flake) Amendment No. 2042, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1190**

Quicker Veterans Benefits Delivery Act: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1725, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit certain reports relating to medical evidence submitted in support of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S1190–91**

Veterans Care Financial Protection Act: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3122, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include on the internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs a warning regarding dishonest, predatory, or otherwise unlawful practices targeting individuals who are eligible for increased pension on the basis of need for regular aid and attendance, and the bill was then passed. **Page S1191**

Lexington VA Health Care System: Senate passed H.R. 4533, to designate the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Lexington VA Health Care System" and to make certain other designations. **Page S1191**

Measures Considered:

Broader Options for Americans Act: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 2579, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage, taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S1131–36, S1138–48**

Pending:

Grassley Amendment No. 1959, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S1131–36, S1138–48**

McConnell (for Toomey/Cruz) Amendment No. 1948 (to Amendment No. 1959), to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States. **Page S1131**

Schumer Modified Amendment No. 1958 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 1959), of a perfecting nature. **Page S1131**

Durbin (for Coons/McCain) Amendment No. 1955 (to Amendment No. 1958), to provide relief from removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States before reaching the age of 18, improve border security, foster United States engagement in Central America. **Page S1131, S1146**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 33), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on Durbin (for Coons/McCain) Amendment No. 1955 (to Amendment No. 1958) (listed above). **Page S1146**

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 34), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on McConnell (for Toomey/Cruz) Amendment No. 1948 (to Amendment No. 1959) (listed above). **Pages S1146–47**

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 35), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on Schumer Modified Amendment No. 1958 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 1959) (listed above). **Pages S1147–48**

By 39 yeas to 60 nays (Vote No. 36), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on Grassley Amendment No. 1959 (listed above). **Page S1148**

Appointments:

National Council on Disability: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 93–112, as amended by Public Law 112–166, and further amended by Public Law 113–128, the reappointment of the following to serve as a member of the National Council on Disability: Neil Romano of Maryland. **Page S1191**

Authorizing Leadership To Make Appointments—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding

the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate. **Page S1191**

Washington's Farewell Address—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following the closing of morning business, on Monday, February 26, 2018, Senator Peters be recognized to deliver Washington's Farewell Address. **Page S1191**

Pro Forma Sessions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, February 16, 2018 at 12 noon; Tuesday, February 20, 2018 at 5 p.m.; Friday, February 23, 2018 at 2 p.m.; and that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, February 23, 2018, it next convene at 3 p.m., on Monday, February 26, 2018. **Page S1191**

Branch Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit. **Page S1149**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, February 15, 2018, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, February 26, 2018. **Page S1149**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1149**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the nomination after the reading of Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 26, 2018, and, notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m. **Page S1191**

Vought Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. **Page S1149**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit. **Page S1149**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1149**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1149**

Quattlebaum Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina. **Pages S1149–50**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. **Page S1150**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1149**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1149**

Scholer Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Karen Gren Scholer, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas. **Page S1150**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina. **Page S1150**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1150**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1150**

Self Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Tilman Eugene Self III, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia. **Page S1150**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Karen Gren Scholer, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas. **Page S1150**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1150**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1150**

Doughty Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Terry A. Doughty, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana. **Page S1150**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Tilman Eugene Self III, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia. **Page S1150**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1150**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1150**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

John Henderson, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

John Marshall Mitnick, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

John C. Demers, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Norman Euell Arflack, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Michael T. Baylous, of West Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of West Virginia for the term of four years.

David G. Jolley, of Tennessee, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Tennessee for the term of four years.

Daniel R. McKittrick, of Mississippi, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

Matthew D. Krueger, of Wisconsin, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of four years.

Neil Jacobs, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Thomas M. Griffin, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States Marshal for the District of South Carolina for the term of four years.

Peter Hendrick Vrooman, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Rwanda.

Joel Danies, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe.

John C. Anderson, of New Mexico, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Mexico for the term of four years.

Joseph D. Brown, of Texas, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas for the term of four years.

John H. Durham, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years.

Brandon J. Fremin, of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Melissa F. Burnison, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs).

Ted G. Kamatchus, of Iowa, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Iowa for the term of four years.

Joseph P. Kelly, of Nebraska, to be United States Attorney for the District of Nebraska for the term of four years.

Scott W. Murray, of New Hampshire, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Hampshire for the term of four years.

David C. Weiss, of Delaware, to be United States Attorney for the District of Delaware for the term of four years.

Michael D. Griffin, of Alabama, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering.

Lisa Gordon-Hagerty, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, Department of Energy.

Kevin Fahey, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

William Roper, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Phyllis L. Bayer, of Mississippi, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Holly W. Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Environmental Protection Agency.

Thomas E. Ayres, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

John H. Gibson II, of Texas, to be Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

Pages S1150–52, S1156, S1191–92

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Naomi C. Earp, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Thelma Drake, of Virginia, to be Federal Transit Administrator.

James Reilly, of Colorado, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey.

Joseph Cella, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu.

David B. Cornstein, of New York, to be Ambassador to Hungary.

Georgette Mosbacher, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Poland.

Jean Carol Hovland, of South Dakota, to be Commissioner of the Administration for Native Americans, Department of Health and Human Services.

Mark Jeremy Bennett, of Hawaii, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Nancy E. Brasel, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

Thomas S. Kleeh, of West Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of West Virginia.

Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Peter J. Phipps, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Michael Y. Scudder, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Amy J. St. Eve, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Eric C. Tostrud, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

Charles J. Williams, of Iowa, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.

Page S1191

Messages from the House: **Page S1162**

Measures Referred: **Page S1162**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1162–63**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S1163**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1164**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1165–66**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1166–70**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1160–62**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1170–89**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1189**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—36) **Pages S1146–48**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:58 p.m., until 12 noon on Friday, February 16, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1191.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the state of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, focusing on pending rules, cryptocurrency regulation, and cross-border agreements, after receiving testimony from J. Christopher Giancarlo, Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Commodities, Risk Management, and Trade: Senators Boozman (Chair), Cochran, Hoeven, Grassley, Thune, Daines, Perdue, Heitkamp, Brown, Bennet, Gillibrand, Donnelly, and Smith.

Subcommittee on Rural Development and Energy: Senators Ernst (Chair), Cochran, Boozman, Hoeven, Thune, Daines, Fischer, Smith, Brown, Klobuchar, Bennet, Donnelly, and Heitkamp.

Subcommittee on Conservation, Forestry, and Natural Resources: Senators Daines (Chair), Cochran, McConnell, Boozman, Grassley, Perdue, Bennet, Leahy, Klobuchar, Donnelly, and Casey.

Subcommittee on Nutrition, Agricultural Research, and Specialty Crops: Senators Perdue (Chair), McConnell, Boozman, Hoeven, Ernst, Fischer, Casey, Leahy, Brown, Gillibrand, and Smith.

Subcommittee on Livestock, Marketing, and Agriculture Security: Senators Fischer (Chair), McConnell, Ernst, Grassley, Thune, Daines, Gillibrand, Leahy, Klobuchar, Heitkamp, and Casey.

Senators Roberts and Stabenow are ex-officio members of each subcommittee.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States Northern Command and United States Southern Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General Lori J. Robinson, USAF, Commander, United States Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command, and Admiral Kurt W. Tidd, USN, Commander, United States Southern Command, both of the Department of Defense.

BUDGET

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request

for fiscal year 2019, after receiving testimony from Alex M. Azar II, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Dennis Shea, of Virginia, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Geneva Office), with the rank of Ambassador, and C. J. Mahoney, of Kansas, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Investment, Services, Labor, Environment, Africa, China, and the Western Hemisphere), with the rank of Ambassador.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Andrea L. Thompson, of South Dakota, to be Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, who was introduced by Senator Thune, Susan A. Thornton, of Maine, to be an Assistant Secretary (East Asian and Pacific Affairs), and Francis R. Fannon, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Energy Resources), who was introduced by Senator Gardner, all of Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1917, to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions; and

The nominations of Michael B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Susan Paradise Baxter, and Marilyn Jean Horan, both to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Daniel Desmond Domenico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Adam I. Klein, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman and Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, McGregor W. Scott, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of California, and Gary G. Schofield, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 36 public bills, H.R. 5030–5065; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 739–740 were introduced. **Pages H1211–12**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1213–14**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 717, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require review of the economic cost of adding a species to the list of endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–560);

H.R. 1274, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require making available to States affected by determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species all data that is the basis of such determinations, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–561);

H.R. 2603, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that nonnative species in the United States shall not be treated as endangered species or threatened species for purposes of that Act, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–562);

H.R. 3131, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to conform citizen suits under that Act with other existing law, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–563, Part 1);

H.R. 3225, to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands (H. Rept. 115–564); and

H.R. 3607, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish fees for medical services provided in units of the National Park System, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–565). **Pages H1210–11**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Simpson to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1181**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H1181, H1200**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:22 a.m. and reconvened at 10:27 a.m. **Page H1192**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:15 a.m. and reconvened at 11:20 a.m. **Page H1198**

Americans with Disabilities Act Education and Reform Act: The House passed H.R. 620, to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to promote compliance through education, to clarify the requirements for demand letters, and to provide for a notice and cure period before the commencement of a private civil action, by a yea-and-nay vote of 225 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 80.

Pages H1183–92, H1192–98, H1198–H1200

Agreed to:

Denham amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 115–559) that ensures the Department of Justice's Disability Rights Section takes action, to the extent practicable, to make ADA compliance publications available in languages commonly used by owners and operators of U.S. businesses;

Pages H1192–94

Speier amendment (No. 4 printed in part A of H. Rept. 115–559) that clarifies that the defendant is still liable if the defendant fails to make substantial progress to remove the barrier; **Pages H1195–96**

Bera amendment (No. 5 printed in part A of H. Rept. 115–559) that shortens the timeline from 180 to 120 total days; and **Pages H1196–97**

McMorris Rodgers amendment (No. 6 printed in part A of H. Rept. 115–559) that strikes the requirement that the written notices of alleged violation include the specific sections of the ADA alleged to have been violated. **Pages H197–98**

Rejected:

Foster amendment (No. 3 printed in part A of H. Rept. 115–559) that sought to allow for punitive damages for noncompliance after the cure period; and **Page H1195**

Langevin amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 115–559) that sought to remove the requirement that a person who claims discrimination must first provide written notice that allows 60 days for an owner to acknowledge receipt of the complaint and 120 days to demonstrate substantial progress in removing the barrier before legal action may be pursued (by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 226 noes, Roll No. 79). **Pages H1194–95, H1198–99**

H. Res. 736, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 620), (H.R. 3299), and (H.R. 3978) was agreed to yesterday, February 14th.

Inspector General for the U.S. House of Representatives—Appointment: The Chair announced on behalf of the Speaker, Majority Leader and Minority Leader, the joint appointment of Mr. Michael Ptasienski of McLean, Virginia, as Inspector General for the U.S. House of Representatives. **Page H1200**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1198–99 and H1199–H1200. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:36 p.m.

Committee Meetings

STRATEGIC COMPETITION WITH CHINA

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Strategic Competition with China". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EVOLUTION, TRANSFORMATION, AND SUSTAINMENT: A REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET REQUEST FOR U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES AND COMMAND

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled "Evolution, Transformation, and Sustainment: A Review and Assessment of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Forces and Command". Testimony was heard from General Raymond A. Thomas, Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command; and Owen West, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict, Department of Defense.

THE OPIOIDS EPIDEMIC: IMPLICATIONS FOR AMERICA'S WORKPLACES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions; and Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a joint hearing entitled "The Opioids Epidemic: Implications for America's Workplaces". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Oversight of the Department of Health and Human Services". Testimony was heard from Alex Azar, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

EXAMINING DE-RISKING AND ITS EFFECT ON ACCESS TO FINANCIAL SERVICES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a

hearing entitled ''Examining De-risking and its Effect on Access to Financial Services''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

INDUSTRY VIEWS OF THE CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection held a hearing entitled ''Industry Views of the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE EFFECT OF SANCTUARY CITY POLICIES ON THE ABILITY TO COMBAT THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security held a hearing entitled ''The Effect of Sanctuary City Policies on the Ability to Combat the Opioid Epidemic''. Testimony was heard from A.J. Louderback, Sheriff, Jackson County, Texas; and public witnesses.

THE COSTS OF DENYING BORDER PATROL ACCESS: OUR ENVIRONMENT AND SECURITY

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''The Costs of Denying Border Patrol Access: Our Environment and Security''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on H.R. 520, the ''National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing on H.R. 2591, the ''Modernizing the Pittman-Robertson Fund for Tomorrow's Needs Act of 2017''; H.R. 4429, the ''Cormorant Control Act''; H.R. 4609, the ''West Fork Fire Station Act of 2017''; H.R. 4647, the ''Recovering America's Wildlife Act''; and H.R. 4851, the ''Kennedy-King Establishment Act of 2018''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Fortenberry, Tipton, Bergman, Carson of Indiana, and Austin Scott of Georgia; Randy Claramunt, Lake Huron Basin Coordinator, Department of Natural Resources, Michigan; Floyd Cook, County Commissioner, Dolores County, Colorado; Gregory Porter, State Representative, Indiana; and a public witness.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—CHECKING IN WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S ACQUISITION AND PROPERTY MANAGER

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled ''General Services Administration—Checking in with the Government's Acquisition and Property Manager''. Testimony was heard from the following General Services Administration officials: Emily W. Murphy, Administrator; Alan B. Thomas, Jr., Commissioner, Federal Acquisition Service; Dan Mathews, Commissioner, Public Buildings Service; and Carol F. Ochoa, Inspector General.

MENTORING, TRAINING, AND APPRENTICESHIPS FOR STEM EDUCATION AND CAREERS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Mentoring, Training, and Apprenticeships for STEM Education and Careers''. Testimony was heard from Victor R. McCrary, Chair, Task Force on the Skilled Technical Workforce, National Science Board; and public witnesses.

RESTORING RURAL AMERICA: HOW AGRITECH IS REVITALIZING THE HEARTLAND

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy, and Trade held a hearing entitled ''Restoring Rural America: How Agritech is Revitalizing the Heartland''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of Positive Train Control Implementation in the United States''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Heck and Kelmer; Juan D. Reyes III, Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration; Robert Sumwalt, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board; and public witnesses.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUDGET REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2019''. Testimony was heard from David J. Shulkin, M.D., Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs.

THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET PROPOSALS

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The President's Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Proposals''. Testimony was heard from Steven T. Mnuchin, Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Friday, February 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, February 16

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 9 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E194
Babin, Brian, Tex., E192, E197
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E193
Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E193, E197
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E192, E197
Faso, John J., N.Y., E196
Foxx, Virginia, N.C., E196
Garamendi, John, Calif., E191
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E191, E194, E195, E197, E198
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E195
Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E194, E197
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E195
McClintock, Tom, Calif., E191
Poe, Ted, Tex., E192, E196
Raskin, Jamie, Md., E191
Rothfus, Keith J., Pa., E194
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E193
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E196

Congressional Record

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 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.