



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2018

No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY K. WEBER, Sr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about Russian interference in our elections.

In the last 18 months, the United States intelligence agencies and our allies abroad have decisively concluded that Russia interfered with our elections. We have sworn testimony from men and women with impeccable records, Democrats and Republicans

alike. Their testimony overwhelmingly states that Russia interfered in our elections and that Russia has done so as well in other Western democracies for years.

Russia's goal with election interference is to destabilize Western democracies. Destabilizing our democracy will weaken our ability to defend ourselves against foreign adversaries like Russia, China, and Iran.

Democratic institutions and systems are the foundation of how we govern ourselves and defend our borders. When the integrity of democratic institutions is doubted, the power of our democracy is weakened.

Make no mistake: attacking the integrity of our democratic institutions is an attempt to weaken our Nation and our way of life. We must ensure that neither Russia nor any other foreign power interferes in our election process in the future.

The House of Representatives seems to have abdicated its official role in investigating Russian interference. It is my hope that the Senate will continue its investigation in a bipartisan manner. Thus, Special Counsel Robert Mueller must be allowed to continue his investigation, following the evidence wherever it leads, and write a comprehensive and complete report without intrusion or obstruction by political power plays.

This is not a Democratic or Republican issue. This is an American issue.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, our first responsibility is to protect our Nation. We take an oath of office every 2 years to defend and protect our Nation from all enemies, foreign and domestic.

I call upon my colleagues, my fellow Americans, to join me in putting partisanship aside, putting our country first, and doing everything we can to prevent foreign interference in our elections in the future.

TARIFFS AND TRADE

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to speak about U.S. trade and the recently raised tariffs on steel and aluminum.

We all want to secure American jobs and increase the opportunity in the U.S. economy, but raising far-reaching tariffs will do just the opposite. The most likely effect of raising tariffs will be other countries adjusting their trade measures to protect their economies and their workers. This is known as a trade war, and no one wins in a trade war.

What's more, American agriculture is always the target of international reactionary and retaliatory trade behavior. California agriculture, which I am a strong advocate of and represent, feels the most intense direct pain from these tariffs. California farmers and ranchers earned roughly 44 percent of their total revenue from international trade in 2016.

But this pain will radiate across the country. Manufacturers, processors, merchants, and farmers will face negative impacts to their businesses as foreign markets close, which will cost both American jobs and profits.

Yes, we have an international trade imbalance that must be addressed, but raising these tariffs, I think, is the wrong strategy, plain and simple. This is why both Republicans and Democrats have publicly expressed grave concern with these recent actions.

The way to address these trade imbalances is to successfully renegotiate and modernize NAFTA and other trade agreements with our European allies. The President and Congress must work together on trade agreements; it is that simple.

Our best approach for successfully renegotiating trade agreements is a way that serves the entire Nation is by Republicans and Democrats coming together and putting in the hard work required for bipartisan negotiations, serious policymaking, and getting the job

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1701

done. That is what we are supposed to do.

OUR JOB IS TO KEEP STUDENTS SAFE

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, as a parent with kids in school, I believe that no parent should have to worry if their child will come home safe at the end of the day. That is why I rise today to join President Trump in urging the Senate to immediately pass the STOP School Violence Act. The House overwhelmingly passed this legislation last week, and now it is time for the U.S. Senate to act and pass this bipartisan, commonsense bill.

Among other positive steps forward, this bipartisan bill would provide funding to enable local schools to make physical and technological improvements to keep students safe.

Southwestern High School in my district has been called the safest school in America because of its focus on security, training, and coordination with local law enforcement. I have had the opportunity to visit Shelby County's Southwestern High School and speak with the leadership there and the Shelby County Sheriff's Department leadership as well, and, frankly, I could not have been more impressed.

If the STOP School Violence Act is enacted, more schools could follow the example set by Southwestern High School. The U.S. Senate needs to do its job now and act quickly to pass this commonsense legislation to secure our schools and keep America's children safe.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. Michael S. Lewis, Roswell Street Baptist Church, Marietta, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we enter into Your presence this day with thanksgiving in our hearts for the gracious gift of life and the opportunities that You have set before us. We bless You for being our Creator and for providing a living relationship of love through Your Son and our Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.

We humble ourselves before You as men and women of this special body

whom You have appointed with the responsibility of serving the people of this Nation. May You fill the minds of each leader with wisdom which is from above, fill each heart with passion for Your glory and the greatest good of others, and fill each decision with the guidance of Your Spirit.

My heart is grateful to voice this intercessory prayer on this day in our Nation's history with fellow citizens. May You unite our hearts to glorify Your name. May You bless the cities and communities of our Nation with peace. May You bless the United States of America, for I humbly make this prayer in the name of Jesus.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SCHNEIDER 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.

WELCOMING DR. MICHAEL S. LEWIS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor of introducing our guest pastor, Dr. Michael Lewis, from my home district and from the great city of Marietta, Georgia.

Dr. Lewis graduated in 1996 with a master of divinity degree from Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. In May of 2005, he received an honorary doctor of divinity degree from Liberty University. He has had the honor of serving in churches in South Carolina, Texas, and Florida as their pastor.

Currently, Dr. Lewis serves as pastor of Roswell Street Baptist Church in Marietta, Georgia, where he lives with his wife of 25 years, Liliana, and their three wonderful daughters.

It is my privilege to introduce Dr. Michael Lewis, who opened us this morning in prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-

minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CELEBRATING WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Women's History Month. Every March, we celebrate the trailblazing women who have enriched our history, our society, and our communities.

This month, it is important to recognize the hardworking women in today's workforce. Today, more than 70 percent of women work outside of the home, and these women account for nearly half of the workforce, while 40 percent of women are their family's top earners.

Because of tax reform, the women of America's workforce will be able to keep more of their hard-earned cash to spend on their families, rather than sending it to Washington. Additionally, working moms and their families will receive double the child tax credit to ensure they have the means to care for their children.

Mr. Speaker, to the naysayers who claimed that tax reform would only benefit rich men, I say that is categorically false. Tax reform already has and will continue to empower the wonderful women in America's workforce to make history worth recognizing.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REVEREND JAMES HAWLEY MCKINNON, JR.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great North Carolinian, a friend to many, and a man of God, Reverend James Hawley McKinnon, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, Jim passed away on Sunday, March 11, at the age of 77. Jim McKinnon preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ in eastern North Carolina for decades. His ministry inspired and motivated so many individuals, both in his home of Wilson, North Carolina, and elsewhere.

Ordained as a minister of the Presbyterian church on September 22, 1968—shortly after the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Senator Robert F. Kennedy—Jim served congregations throughout North Carolina; first as an associate pastor in Fayetteville, and then as a senior pastor in Morehead City, Charlotte, and Wilson, where he retired after 26 years as senior pastor of First Presbyterian Church.

Jim McKinnon was a strong, strong pillar in our community and he will be missed. Jim McKinnon is survived by his wife of 51 long years, Louise Cherry McKinnon; and their two sons, also Presbyterian ministers, James, III—we

call him Trip—and his wife, Angie, from Brunswick, Georgia; and John and his wife, Darci, from Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

His beloved four grandchildren are: John Brandon and Rebecca Louise from Brunswick, Georgia; Aidan Gayle and Ian McKay from Oklahoma City.

Jim was preceded in death by his grandson, James Hawley McKinnon, IV—Jamie.

Let it be said, Mr. Speaker, that Reverend Jim McKinnon made a difference in this world as he helped change lives for so many Americans.

CONGRATULATING THE BELLEVILLE WEST BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly honor the Belleville West basketball team for winning the 2018 4A State tournament.

It was truly a “March Madness” in Peoria, Illinois, this weekend as the Maroons played in a back-and-forth State title game against Whitney Young Dolphins. It took overtime, but Belleville West held off Whitney Young for a 60 to 56 victory to take home the championship trophy. This is the first basketball State title in school history.

I extend a heartfelt congratulations to the players, coaches, staff, school officials, families, and friends who supported these young men on this incredible journey. Illinois 12th is proud of you.

Go, Maroons.

HEALTHCARE SHOULD BE A HUMAN RIGHT FOR ALL

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this Friday marks the eighth anniversary of the Affordable Care Act being signed into law. In the richest country in the world, healthcare should be a basic human right, not a privilege for some.

While the ACA is far from perfect—we know that—it made great progress, ensuring millions and millions of Americans that they could have health insurance, that they could have healthcare when they need it, making it more affordable, making sure that Americans with preexisting conditions were not denied coverage because they were sick or kicked off their coverage because they got sick.

Unfortunately, though, this House has spent a good deal of the last year or so trying to take back some of those advances that we have made, essentially, putting more families in the position of having that economic uncertainty of not knowing whether or not their premiums will continue to go up or their copays will go up, or prescription drugs will be available but com-

pletely unaffordable to them; putting families back in the place where they are, essentially, one illness away from losing everything that they have worked for.

We should work together because we know there are improvements that we need to make. We should work across the aisle to improve this law and move forward.

BEST BUDDIES FRIENDSHIP WALK

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Best Buddies International for a successful 5K walk in downtown Miami this past Saturday, March 17.

Best Buddies International was founded in 1989 by one of my constituents, Anthony K. Shriver, and it promotes the idea that every person has a gift and that every person can contribute. This message is emblematic of what makes America successful, and it has made Best Buddies a thriving global organization serving thousands of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

The Best Buddies Friendship Walk allows those who are often excluded because of their differences the opportunity to create one-on-one friendships that last a lifetime. It is that model that has allowed Best Buddies to make extraordinary advancements in the autism community to increase understanding and acceptance of the disability.

I would like to extend my congratulations for a successful Best Buddies Friendship Walk. I am so delighted to see my constituents giving the gift of friendship to individuals in south Florida with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

BOOTS TO BUSINESS

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of the Boots to Business program.

Running a small business requires a wide variety of skills. One day you are the company's accountant, the next day you are researching marketing strategies.

Many of our servicemembers have the temperament and experience to excel as small-business owners and entrepreneurs, but they lack the industry-specific skills to turn their dream into a reality.

The Boots to Business program helps bridge this gap by offering exiting servicemembers and spouses a 2-day in-person course on business ownership, followed by more in-depth instruction through an 8-week online course.

Since the program launched in 2013, more than 50,000 servicemembers and

spouses have participated, learning how to start and grow businesses and, thereby, grow our economy.

This month, I introduced the bipartisan Veteran Entrepreneurship Training Act with my friend from Iowa, Congressman ROD BLUM. The bill would codify the Boots to Business program. Our veterans serve our country with honor. They deserve our support as they transition from military to civilian life. I urge my colleagues to join me on this bipartisan effort.

CREATING TRANSPARENCY THROUGH DISCLOSURE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Foreign Influence Transparency Act, which requires organizations, such as the Confucius Institute, to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, FARA, if they promote the political agenda of a foreign country.

The goal of this legislation is to increase transparency between foreign governments, universities, and students. Americans have the right to know if they are consuming propaganda that is produced by a foreign government.

Currently, FARA contains a technicality that allows foreign governments or organizations to push their political agenda under the facade of an “academic pursuit.” The Foreign Influence Transparency Act will clarify the intent and ensure that all propaganda funded by foreign governments at least contains a disclaimer.

The Foreign Influence Transparency Act also decreases the monetary threshold of foreign donations that universities are required to disclose. Currently, universities only report on donations they receive of \$250,000 or more, while organizations, such as the Confucius Institute, operate below that level. This results in a lack of disclosure to students and parents. The goal of this legislation is simple, and that is to create transparency through disclosure.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LEW VANDERZYL

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Lew Vanderzyl, a dedicated educator; a veteran; and a devoted father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, who passed away last month.

Lew's lifetime of service included a deployment with the 40th Infantry Division during the Korean war, followed

by a half century as a teacher and administrator, and 17 years as a Riverside school board member.

As school board president, Lew demonstrated his moral courage by insisting that a local high school be named after Martin Luther King, despite a wave of protests and intense opposition. He will be remembered by the Riverside community as someone who cared deeply for his students.

Lew Vanderzyl, an avid reader, crossword puzzler, and traveler, and a constant source of wisdom and kindness, will be dearly missed by our community. May his memory be a blessing to the friends and family he leaves behind.

□ 1215

HONORING LOUISE MCINTOSH
SLAUGHTER

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER served the people of Rochester in Monroe County, as well as the city of Buffalo, in the United States Congress from 1987 until her untimely death last week.

LOUISE SLAUGHTER was a champion of progressive causes and a liberal lioness in the United States Congress. She knew who she was fighting for, and she knew how to fight.

For the homeless, the hopeless, and the voiceless, LOUISE SLAUGHTER championed all their causes because her political ethos was forever to defend the dignity of every citizen. She never deviated from that cause and reinforced it each and every day on the floor of this Congress, the institution that she loved.

She served as chair and ranking member of the Rules Committee and championed the first \$500 million earmark for breast cancer research to the National Institutes of Health and the Violence Against Women Act. These are among a long list of impressive accomplishments that were championed by LOUISE SLAUGHTER.

Her friends and her family will miss her, but her accomplishments will forever be enshrined on this institution representing the people that she loved in Rochester and Monroe County.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2018.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representa-

tives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 20, 2018, at 11:18 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 3731.

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

United States Holocaust Memorial Council.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 4566, ALLEVIATING
STRESS TEST BURDENS TO HELP
INVESTORS ACT; PROVIDING FOR
CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5247,
TRICKETT WENDLER, FRANK
MONGIELLO, JORDAN McLINN,
AND MATTHEW BELLINA RIGHT
TO TRY ACT OF 2018; AND FOR
OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 787 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 787

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4566) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-65 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled

by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of March 23, 2018.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 22, 2018, or March 23, 2018, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 5. Section 3(a) of House Resolution 5 is amended by striking "the first session of".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 787 provides for the consideration of two important bills whose focus is to empower the people of this Nation by removing governmental obstacles standing in the way of life and prosperity in this country.

The first bill, H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, is a bipartisan effort from the Committee on Financial Services under Chairman JEB HENSARLING, authored by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

The second piece of legislation in today's rule, H.R. 5247, the Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2018, authorizes the use of certain drugs to eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or a condition for which there is a reasonable likelihood that death will occur in a matter of months.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, equally divided between the Chair and the ranking members of the Committee on Financial Services.

The rule makes one amendment in order, authored by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member. Further, the rule provides for the consideration of one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

For H.R. 5247, the Right to Try Act of 2018, the rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the Chair

and the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Although no amendments to the bill were made in order, the rule does provide for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, before I speak about the substance of the two bills under consideration in the rule before us today, I do want to take a minute to honor our colleague and the Rules Committee's ranking member, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, who passed away unexpectedly last week.

I have known Ranking Member SLAUGHTER since I first joined Congress in 2003. We spent countless hours debating every issue one can imagine in the Rules Committee upstairs, often long into the night.

When I joined the Rules Committee in 2013, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER was then the ranking member, but it was under her chairmanship where she ushered through the Affordable Care Act, where my largest memories reside. During the debate for the Affordable Care Act, I went up to H-313, the Rules Committee hearing room, with 18 amendments under my arm, a small selection of the many ways I felt the law needed to be changed.

Certain that I would only be able to get through a small portion of those amendments before I was cut off, I began my testimony. To the chairwoman's credit, she let me go on and on and on, and despite my being convinced that she was going to gavel me down at any second, she allowed me to finish speaking on all 18 amendments.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't until I actually became a member of the Rules Committee several years later that I discovered there is, in fact, no time limit for Members and witnesses to speak, much to the chagrin of many Members when we debate the National Defense Authorization Act.

Ranking Member SLAUGHTER was always proud of her background as a microbiologist, and it served her well during her tenure in Congress, because, after all, we deal with, sometimes, almost miniscule, microscopic issues, so time as a microbiologist would be good preparation.

One moment where I was glad to be able to work with Ranking Member SLAUGHTER was in 2007. This was right after the Democrats took control of the House. Ms. SLAUGHTER had been pushing for years for legislation that would prohibit the discrimination of employees based on genetic information.

The legislation was forward leaning, long before companies offered DNA testing kits in every pharmacy of the country. And, in fact, it was former Speaker Newt Gingrich himself who brought this bill to my attention, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, which I was proud to support as it moved through the Energy and Commerce Committee and was eventually signed into law by President Bush.

I would also like to mention Don Sisson, the staff director for the minor-

ity on the Rules Committee. Don has been with the committee for years—even at one point working under Chairman Drier—and has been with the ranking member of the Rules Committee through many events in the past years, including the death of her own husband, who, in fact, often sat in the audience of the Rules Committee and joined Ms. SLAUGHTER during our late-night Rules hearings.

Don is, indeed, a loyal staffer, himself hailing from Rochester, New York, and is a great example of how Ms. SLAUGHTER's life and passing is affecting so many people. I do want to thank Don for his written remarks that were read into the record of the Rules Committee last night from the staff perspective on the passing of Ranking Member SLAUGHTER.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to hold off making further comments on the legislation before us to allow others to speak.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, like my friend from Texas, I was overcome with sadness by the tragic news of LOUISE's passing, who was not only the ranking member of the Rules Committee, but the first and only woman to have chaired the committee.

For 30 years, LOUISE poured every ounce of energy she had into serving her constituents in upstate New York. She never hesitated to speak her mind, and she never wavered in espousing her beliefs. I will always be truly grateful for the time that I had to serve alongside her.

LOUISE was one of my dearest friends in Congress, having not only served with her on the Rules Committee but also on the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Helsinki Commission.

Her legacy speaks for itself. She was not just a champion of women's rights. She was a champion of working families everywhere. This Nation has lost one of our fiercest public servants, and her absence will leave an unfillable void.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my deepest condolences to LOUISE's daughters: Megan Secatore, Amy Slaughter, and Emily Minerva; her seven grandchildren and one great-grandson; as well as to her friends, constituents, and congressional staff during this extremely difficult time. Her spirit and loving memory will forever live in the Halls of Congress. She will be dearly missed.

Mr. Speaker, turning to today's rules, this rule brings the number of closed rules for the 115th Congress to 74. In other words, more than 50 percent of the legislation coming to the Rules Committee has been closed off from an open and honest debate by my Republican friends.

At the beginning of this Congress, we were told by my Republican colleagues that they would run the government in an open manner. They even championed regular order. Well, that spirit has clearly been jettisoned in favor of an overly partisan approach to governing.

By way of example, one of today's bills, H.R. 5247, was introduced last Tuesday, brought to the House floor for a vote on the same day without the committee of jurisdiction holding one single hearing on the bill or Members having the opportunity to offer their amendments.

□ 1230

Not surprisingly, the measure failed to pass under suspension of the rules.

What was the response of my friends on the other side of the aisle when the vote failed? Did my Republican colleagues insist that the Energy and Commerce Committee hold hearings on the measure? Did my Republican colleagues on the committee of jurisdiction invite experts to speak on what the consequences would be if this bill were to become law? Did my Republican colleagues work with Democrats to come up with a bipartisan solution? No.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you what did happen. The Republican leadership ignored the problems with the measure and brought it to the Rules Committee last night for it to be considered on the House floor today.

Now, this flies in the face of regular order, to ask the entire membership of the people's House to vote on something for which no one can honestly say they know what the unintended consequences would be if this bill were to become law.

Bad process makes bad bills, and the process we have witnessed with this bill can't get much worse. Yet it did get worse when the Republican majority blocked the ranking member's, Mr. PALLONE's, substitute amendment, an amendment which was both germane and had bipartisan support.

Madam Speaker, the Republican majority took it a step further when they extended the Holman rule for the remainder of the 115th Congress. My friends on the other side of the aisle are yet again seeking to scapegoat Federal employees, make cuts to the Federal workforce, and politicize the civil service system that was established to professionalize agencies and offices, all while ignoring the waste and abuses in the reality show of the Trump administration.

Madam Speaker, challenged by the American people to bring up comprehensive gun reform, House leadership instead brings up one bill that hasn't gone through anything resembling regular order and another bill that weakens and undermines a valuable tool that gives financial companies and regulators an opportunity to identify and correct problems before they could lead to another financial crisis.

Every year, roughly 35,000 people are killed by guns. Moreover, 2,700 children and teens are shot and killed, and over 14,000 more are shot and injured every year. That is an average of 47 American children and teens shot every day.

And the effects of gun violence extend far beyond those struck by a bullet. Gun violence shapes the lives of the millions of children who witness it, know someone who was shot, or live in fear of the next shooting. We have witnessed the effects over the last month with the students from Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School.

This weekend, hundreds of thousands of students and their supporters will descend on Washington, D.C., to demand that the Federal Government take action to stop the epidemic of mass shootings, which have become all too familiar.

No less than this morning when I turned on the television, less than an hour and a half away from here, in yet another school, yet another shooting. Fortunately, it appears that the resource officer there engaged the shooter early on and may have caused there to be less damage, although some people were injured, and one or two critically.

We can no longer ignore what gun violence really is in this country. It is an epidemic.

But do not just take my word for it or the students who witnessed 14 friends' and 3 teachers' lives brutally cut short. The American Medical Association, following the tragedy at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, declared gun violence in this country "a very public health crisis," a crisis which the Republican majority's only answer is to offer thoughts and prayers and further block any Democratic measures to address this crisis and to continue to block the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention from even researching gun violence.

Instead of finally making permanent the status of Dreamers in this country as full citizens, the Republican majority ignores their calls and the calls of the vast majority of Americans and, instead, brings up one bill that undermines a valuable early warning system of our Nation's economy and another bill that has gone through a completely closed process.

Enough is enough. President Donald John Trump says he wants to fix this problem. The Speaker says he wants to fix this problem. We on this side of the aisle clearly want to fix this problem. So let's do it already.

Madam Speaker, last week, when I was managing yet another useless financial regulation, I commented and I asked the American public to respond:

Would you rather us stop banks from having stress tests or would you prefer that we deal with the deferred action for children in this country, 800,000 of whom are Dreamers, 120 of whom lose their status every day?

Would you prefer that we deal with the measure that is on the floor today

or that we deal seriously with a variety of issues having to do with gun violence in our society, which I have described as an epidemic?

Would you prefer as a priority, America, that we deal with these trivial matters that are going nowhere fast or that we center ourselves and focus on those measures that are vital to the survival, security, and safety of all Americans?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, it was indeed incredibly disappointing last week when our Democratic colleagues did not join us in supporting what was very carefully crafted right-to-try legislation.

The President came and talked to us at the beginning of February, and right to try was one of the issues that he highlighted there from the podium. So it should be to no one's great surprise that this House would indeed take up and work on that issue that the President himself highlighted. Right to try was the one piece of legislation that President Trump specifically promised to the American people in the State of the Union address.

Today, I want it to be known that I stand with the President. I stand with the thousands of Americans with terminal diseases and their families and their friends in getting this important bill passed.

Since 2014, 37 States, including my home State of Texas, have passed a version of a right-to-try law, and through a strong grassroots movement, they have accomplished that.

Today, the House is considering H.R. 5247, the Right to Try Act of 2018, which would improve access to experimental treatments for terminally ill patients and offer them a chance—a second chance, a third chance—at life.

Over the course of the last decade, our Nation has achieved unprecedented innovation and scientific breakthroughs. Thanks to researchers in our academic institutions and those working in the pharmaceutical and medical device industries, American patients have access to innovative treatments.

Regardless of these achievements, I hear from patients with serious life-threatening conditions, including my constituents from north Texas, who are frustrated with what they see as regulatory barriers from trying and experimenting with new therapies when every other avenue has failed.

It does seem we are at a crossroads when lifesaving treatments, while not yet approved, both exist and remain unavailable to patients.

As a physician, I understand that access to investigational drugs and therapies is a deeply personal priority for those seeking treatment for themselves or loved ones with a serious and life-threatening condition.

It is crucial to mention the multi-stakeholder efforts that have gone into

improving the original right-to-try bill. Chairman WALDEN of the Energy and Commerce Committee led negotiations with the Commissioner of the United States Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Scott Gottlieb, and with other stakeholders to ensure that this legislation opens the door to innovative experimental drugs for these patients without necessarily compromising the vital work and the mission of the Food and Drug Administration. The product of those negotiations is a bill that strikes the proper balance between ensuring patient safety and granting access to these treatments.

I also want to mention that the Subcommittee on Health did have a hearing in this regard October 3. We heard from the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration during that hearing. We heard from a number of patient groups and stakeholders who felt that it was, in fact, in their best interest for us to advance legislation.

Currently, the Food and Drug Administration conducts an expanded access program aimed at helping patients who do not qualify for clinical trials to gain access to therapies that the agency has yet to approve. While this program makes a good faith effort to help those patients, right to try would create an alternative pathway for those individuals, allowing them to access eligible investigational drugs.

The fact is that individuals may not qualify for a clinical trial if they do not meet very specific patient inclusion criteria, which may include factors such as age, gender, type and stage of disease, previous treatment history, and other medical conditions. There are also many patients for whom participation in a clinical trial is not feasible, especially those who live in rural areas far from where those academic clinical trial sites exist.

Most, if not all, of the patients with a terminal medical condition fall into one of these categories. This legislation allows those patients to participate in the alternative pathway so long as they are certified by a physician who is in good standing and abides by the rules laid out in the bill.

Again, we worked closely with the Food and Drug Administration to ensure that the new alternative pathway does not hinder or conflict with the critically important oversight that that agency conducts. While some people may have reservations about the safety of a new pathway, this bill protects patients from manufacturers mislabeling or misbranding drugs, requires sponsors and manufacturers to report adverse events to the Food and Drug Administration, and provides certain liability protections for parties participating in the new pathway. This alternative pathway would also be limited to individuals who have exhausted all FDA-approved treatment options.

Additionally, only certain investigational drugs are considered eligible under this legislation. In order to qualify, the drug must have completed a

phase one clinical trial, must have an active application, must be under active development or production by the manufacturer, and must not be the subject of a clinical hold.

Eligible patients include those suffering from a stage of a disease or condition for which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur in a matter of months or that would result in significant irreversible morbidity that is likely to lead to premature death.

This revised right-to-try bill also provides certainty to manufacturers in the drug approval process. It is essential that we do not create additional hurdles in that process. The legislation clearly states that the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services “may not use a clinical outcome associated with the use of an eligible investigational drug . . . to delay or adversely affect the review or approval of such drug.”

□ 1245

Since the Health Subcommittee first considered the right-to-try legislation, the bill has passed in the Senate, and we have had many conversations with patients, advocates, the administration, and stakeholders on all sides of this complex topic. That collaborative effort was necessary, and I am certainly grateful to all who participated in those discussions.

Madam Speaker, this represents months of hard work and thoughtful discussions and decisions. I believe this legislation is a positive step forward in our shared goal of improving care for American patients. Again, this was the one aspect of the President’s State of the Union Address where he asked us specifically to act on this legislation.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, last night in the Rules Committee, I had dialogue with the author of this legislation and also the ranking member, Mr. PALLONE. I indicated to them that I have very strong sympathies regarding persons who are in the apparent throes of death and seeking some hope, and medication can have its advantages, and experimental medication can have its advantages.

My quarrel with the legislation is that it didn’t go through regular order. I don’t understand why, with all of the experts. I introduced into the RECORD in the Rules Committee last night a substantial number of organizations and individuals who have come forward. They all agree that something along the lines of what is being sought ought to be undertaken, but it would allow for those persons to have added input into what ultimately may be significant legislation. But my friends on

the other side plow right ahead on this matter that I reiterate was brought on suspension last week that failed, and then brought here last night for purposes of a rule along with financial stress legislation.

So it is not that many of us are not sympathetic to the underlying principle that is being offered. It is that it is rank process and that we should not allow legislation to continue to come to the floor of the House of Representatives that blocks out a significant number of persons who may have input that would make the measure be much more salient to a more significant number of people.

It is for that reason that I continue to ask the questions: What are our priorities here? What is the rush with reference to this matter while we are ignoring a significant number of other matters that we could be undertaking?

In addition to that, we were supposed to go to the Rules Committee this afternoon on the omnibus bill; and now, evidently, there is wrangling going on between the parties and bicameral between the Senate and the House, and that measure isn’t ready to come to the floor.

Yet we are dealing with something that isn’t the highest priority of the moment. I commented last night, anything that will help a person who is facing death is the kind of thing that we would want that person to have that opportunity to deal with. But we have children who have been killed and we have children who are facing the potential for that kind of horror, yet we are doing nothing.

So, Madam Speaker, once again, I rise to appeal to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Please, listen to the American people and do more to help end the epidemic of gun violence that has plagued our Nation and that the American people are demanding Congress to do more.

For example, in a recent Gallup Poll, nearly two-thirds of adults wanted stricter laws on the sale of firearms. According to a recent NPR/Ipsos poll, 75 percent of respondents said they think gun laws should be stricter.

As I indicated earlier, just this morning there were reports of another school shooting just an hour and a half from Washington, D.C., in Great Mills, Maryland. The American people are begging this body to do something to end this epidemic, so I offer the majority this opportunity:

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up four commonsense gun safety bills: H.R. 4240, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act; H.R. 3464, the Background Check Completion Act; H.R. 2598, the Gun Violence Restraining Order Act; and H.R. 1478, the Gun Violence Research Act.

These bills would close the dangerous gun show and internet sale background check loopholes, prevent the sale of guns without a completed background

check, ensure that people who are a danger to themselves or others can be prevented from possessing a gun, and lift the prohibition on government-sponsored scientific research on the causes of gun violence.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can finally do something to address gun violence.

Through you, Madam Speaker, I would advise my friend from Texas that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close when he is prepared to close.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), who is a fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), as well as the good gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), because I want to take just a minute.

I think it is appropriate at this time during this debate on a rule to remember Ms. LOUISE SLAUGHTER, our ranking member of the Rules Committee, a historical position. She was the very first woman to be the chairman of the Rules Committee. She gave three decades of service to our Nation through the U.S. Congress. As importantly—or, to me, more importantly—she was someone whom I consider a personal friend.

LOUISE was an individual who I said yesterday could really transcend between politics and personal relationships. We had some very heated debates—a good example is today—and very strong differences of opinions, but we can do that. That is our job to do that. But LOUISE also taught us that we could do that without being negative to each other in a personal way. She was great at that. She embodied and personified the ability to have an objection without being objectionable, and I admired that greatly about her.

She was a senior Member and I was a very junior Member. She didn’t have to do this, but in many ways she took me under her wing when I became a Member of Congress. We served on the Rules Committee together, and I very much relished that relationship that we had.

Another thing that we had in common was we joined a very exclusive club, one that several other Members of this body belong to, and that is those people who have lost their spouses. When I was going through that very personally difficult time, LOUISE

had the similar experience. She was very gracious to me to be able to help me through that very difficult time. We exchanged books. Many Members of Congress have read books by C.S. Lewis. LOUISE and I had many discussions about some of the things in some of his writings. In kind of a funny way, as she would do in manipulating me into thinking I was helping her, she was actually having me help myself through that very challenging time. I will always be forever grateful to her for doing that.

She stood strong, and she was a formidable opponent. When she was managing the rule for the Democrats on the other side of the floor, it was always a challenging task, and you had to be on your game when you were on this side making the debate with her.

I count myself very fortunate to have been able to know her and to have been able to work with her. I join together with all of my colleagues and her family to be able to remember her and honor her memory; and I will continue to do so, as she has truly left a large mark on this institution.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would say to my friend from Washington what I said last night: We would do a great service to LOUISE's memory if we were to make more open rules here on the House floor; and I will argue for her in that regard.

Madam Speaker, before I close, I want to again reiterate the tremendous loss felt in this Chamber with the passing of our longtime colleague, Congresswoman LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER. She was a champion of all the issues she cared about and a giant here in the House of Representatives. Her wisdom will be missed every day.

Madam Speaker, the people's House should be approaching our work in a manner that is fair to all Americans, in a manner where the appropriate committee of jurisdiction holds hearings and markups, in a manner where experts in the field are consulted, and in a manner where Members of both parties have the opportunity to offer amendments and debate the contents of the bill.

The process we are witnessing here today is truly a slap in the face to regular order. A bill that has zero input from members on the Energy and Commerce Committee or that has been the subject of any thoughtful discussion is suddenly on the House floor for a vote.

Now, I respect my friend from Texas' view that last year in the Senate, and even perhaps since that time, and throughout the country, right-to-try measures have passed in several States to some degree. But this particular bill that is on the floor that we are making a rule for has not gone through regular order; and that, then, disallows a significant number of persons who would have an opportunity to have input to what could be legislation that all sides could agree upon. Our failure to undertake to do that is a disservice, in my

view, to the institution and to the measure that is being sought to be passed here today.

This is not just an affront to normal House procedure; it is downright undemocratic and emblematic of the Republican majority's inability to govern. I think it will redound to their discredit that they are not allowing this House to proceed under regular order.

As I indicated earlier, more than 50 percent of all of the measures that have come to the Rules Committee and have ultimately come to the floor of the House of Representatives have been under closed rules, which means that Members who represent millions of people in America do not have opportunities to offer amendments that might make the measure better or, at the very least, have their views heard with reference to substantive legislation that is moving through this body.

□ 1300

If we continue down this path for the remainder of this session, we will probably break the 100th barrier on closed rules. We have already had more closed rules than in the history of legislating in this country.

That is not fair. That is basically all we are arguing. Open up the process. Let every Member have an opportunity for input on behalf of his or her constituents. It is the right thing to do. What has been happening is the dead wrong thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Dallas Morning News from 2010. The title of the article—and I am not going to read the whole thing—is: "Pelosi Pulled Strings to Let Dying Dallas Lawyer Try Experimental Cancer Drug."

[From the Dallas Morning News, 2010]

PELOSI PULLED STRINGS TO LET DYING DALLAS LAWYER BARON TRY EXPERIMENTAL CANCER DRUG

(By Todd J. Gilman)

WASHINGTON.—Dallas' top Democratic donors will cut big checks to share dinner later this month with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi. Most will be motivated by a desire to protect the party's congressional majority.

Lisa Blue will have an extra reason: to say thanks for Pelosi's efforts when her husband, Fred Baron, was dying of bone marrow cancer. His only option was an experimental drug whose manufacturer refused to give permission to use it for Baron's condition.

"He was a big fan of hers, and now I am as well," Blue said.

Baron, the "King of Toxic Torts," built a fortune suing on behalf of asbestos victims. He died the week before Election Day 2008 at age 61.

A prolific Democratic fundraiser, he served as finance chief that year for his friend John Edwards, who also made his fortune in court. Baron later acknowledged funneling large sums to Edwards' mistress—a scandal that gave ammunition to those who already despised trial lawyers.

But to Blue, first and foremost, Baron was a husband.

The tale she tells of his final weeks is not so different than any widow might tell, except, of course, that the couple had friends in especially high places—friends like Pelosi, who will headline the Aug. 24 dinner to raise cash for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

In 2002, Baron was diagnosed with multiple myeloma. By October 2008, his doctors at the Mayo Clinic were telling him he had just days to live.

They also offered a glimmer of hope. Over the years, the couple had donated about \$1 million to Mayo. The staff was especially diligent, Blue said. They tested an arsenal of drugs and finally discovered that Baron's cancer responded surprisingly well, in the lab, to a drug called Tysabri.

Mayo had an ample supply, but the drug was—and still is—approved only for treatment of multiple sclerosis and Crohn's disease. The manufacturer, Biogen Idec, refused to give permission, even under special "compassionate use" rules that protect a drugmaker from a black mark in case of an adverse outcome.

Biogen said it didn't want to jeopardize the drug's availability to other patients. (The company did not respond to a request for comment last week.)

"I told Mayo, 'I'll sign anything, I'll release anything. Just give him the drug,'" Blue said.

Blue, also a top lawyer, began making calls. She started with Lance Armstrong, the cyclist and cancer survivor, whom she had represented.

"I started going through Fred's Rolodex," she said. "I called every politician, every celebrity that I knew and just begged them to help. . . . I must have made 200 calls."

She called clinics in Canada, trying in vain to find doctors willing to administer the drug without Biogen's OK. She hired a lawyer and prepared to sue Mayo to force it to dispense the drug. She even bought some Tysabri online from Australia, intending to send stepson Andrew Baron to smuggle it back, she said.

The younger Baron posted an open plea online to Biogen, noting that Bill Clinton, Sens. John Kerry and Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, Sen. Tom Harkin of Iowa and even the head of the Food and Drug Administration had urged the company to reconsider.

"You talk about mental anguish," Blue recounted. "Fred, every day, would wake up and he said, 'Am I going to get the drug?'"

Others were supportive, she said, but Pelosi "put her heart and soul" into the cause, as did Harkin.

Somehow—Blue still isn't sure how—Pelosi cajoled the FDA to find a legal justification that let Mayo administer the drug, even without Biogen's consent.

"Nancy figured out a way," she said.

The drug beat back the cancer for a few days, but not enough.

Blue has no illusion that a typical family could pull such strings.

"There are so many cases like Fred's," she said. "One thing he taught me was politics matters. What a personal experience for me to understand how politics matters."

And no, she added, "It's not fair that other people can't pick up the phone and make the government give them a drug. . . . It was just such an awakening about how the drug companies have so much power."

That's what she'll tell Pelosi over dinner.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this article references events that occurred in 2008.

In 2002, this individual was diagnosed with multiple myeloma. By October of 2008, his doctors were telling him that

he had just days to live. They also offered a glimmer of hope. There was perhaps one chance of therapy. It was an unproven therapy that might, in fact, be helpful to him.

The family made inquiries, made entreaties, but they were not successful until they invoked the then-Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, who actually helped this lawyer get access to this medication. Unfortunately, it was not successful. His disease spread to a point where the therapy was not helpful. But the family observed, "NANCY figured out a way."

How about that. The Speaker of the House figured out a way to get this medication to an individual who was dying of a disease, who obviously was very important—a large Democratic donor, and I get that.

But the Speaker of the House intervened because the clinic where he was being treated felt that they did not have the authority to give him the medication. The company that was manufacturing the medication did not feel that it was in anyone's best interest to give him the medication. But NANCY found a way.

Well, Mr. Speaker, today, we are going to find a way. The President asked us, and we are going to find a way for those millions of Americans who are asking for that same chance.

So today's rule provides for consideration of two important consumer-driven pieces of legislation:

H.R. 4566, by Mr. POLIQUIN, will help alleviate some of the regulations that were put in place under the Dodd-Frank Act.

H.R. 5247, the right-to-try bill which garnered a majority of bipartisan support last week, will give patients who have nowhere else to turn another option to fight the potentially fatal health conditions with which they have been diagnosed.

I do want to thank President Trump and Vice President PENCE for their leadership on this issue and helping us understand here in this body how important it is to move forward with this patient-centered legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support today's rule and the two underlying pieces of legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 787 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 6. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4240) to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one

hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 4240 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3464) to prohibit firearms dealers from selling a firearm prior to the completion of a background check. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 3464 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2598) to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others new tools to prevent gun violence. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily

order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 9. Immediately after the disposition of H.R. 2598, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1478) To repeal the provision that in practice prohibits the Department of Health and Human Services from sponsoring research on gun violence in fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4240, H.R. 3464, H.R. 2598, or H.R. 1478.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the *Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives*, (6th edition, page 135). Here's

how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1340

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia) at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 787; and

Adoption of House Resolution 787, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4566, ALLEVIATING STRESS TEST BURDENS TO HELP INVESTORS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5247, TRICKETT WENDLER, FRANK MONGIELLO, JORDAN MCLINN, AND MATTHEW BELLINA RIGHT TO TRY ACT OF 2018; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 787) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4566) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize the use of eligible investigational drugs by eligible patients who have been diagnosed with a stage of a disease or condition in which there is reasonable likelihood that death will occur within a matter of months, or with another eligible illness, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 181, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Cheney	Flores
Aderholt	Coffman	Fortenberry
Allen	Cole	Fox
Amash	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Gaetz
Arrington	Comer	Gallagher
Babin	Comstock	Garrett
Bacon	Conaway	Gianforte
Banks (IN)	Cook	Gibbs
Barr	Costello (PA)	Gohmert
Barton	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bergman	Crawford	Gosar
Biggs	Culberson	Gowdy
Billirakis	Curbelo (FL)	Granger
Bishop (MI)	Curtis	Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Davidson	Graves (LA)
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Blum	Denham	Griffith
Bost	Dent	Grothman
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Guthrie
Brat	DesJarlais	Handel
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Brooks (AL)	Donovan	Harris
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Hartzler
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Herrera Beutler
Bucshon	Dunn	Hice, Jody B.
Budd	Emmer	Higgins (LA)
Burgess	Estes (KS)	Hill
Byrne	Farenthold	Holding
Calvert	Faso	Hollingsworth
Carter (GA)	Ferguson	Hudson
Carter (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga
Chabot	Fleischmann	Hultgren

Hunter	Meadows	Scott, Austin
Hurd	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
Issa	Messer	Sessions
Jenkins (KS)	Mitchell	Shimkus
Jenkins (WV)	Moolenaar	Shuster
Johnson (LA)	Mullin	Simpson
Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Smith (MO)
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Smith (NE)
Jordan	Norman	Smith (NJ)
Joyce (OH)	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Katko	Olson	Smucker
Kelly (MS)	Palazzo	Stefanik
Kelly (PA)	Palmer	Stewart
King (IA)	Paulsen	Stivers
King (NY)	Pearce	Taylor
Kinzinger	Perry	Tenney
Knight	Pittenger	Thompson (PA)
Kustoff (TN)	Poe (TX)	Thornberry
Labrador	Poliquin	Tipton
LaHood	Posey	Troott
LaMalfa	Ratcliffe	Trott
Lamborn	Reed	Turner
Lance	Reichert	Upton
Latta	Renacci	Valadao
Lewis (MN)	Rice (SC)	Wagner
LoBiondo	Roby	Walberg
Long	Roe (TN)	Walden
Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Walker
Love	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Weber (TX)
MacArthur	Rooney, Francis	Webster (FL)
Marchant	Rooney, Thomas	Wenstrup
Marino	J.	Westerman
Marshall	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams
Massie	Roskam	Wilson (SC)
Mast	Ross	Wittman
McCarthy	Rothfus	Womack
McCaul	Rouzer	Woodall
McClintock	Royce (CA)	Yoder
McHenry	Russell	Yoho
McKinley	Rutherford	Young (AK)
McMorris	Sanford	Young (IA)
Rodgers	Scalise	Zeldin
McSally	Schweikert	

NAYS—181

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal
Aguilar	F.	Lowe
Barragán	Ellison	Lujan Grisham,
Bass	Engel	M.
Beatty	Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray
Bera	Españillat	Lynch
Beyer	Esty (CT)	Maloney,
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Carolyn B.
Blumenauer	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Blunt Rochester	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
Bonamici	Fudge	McCollum
Boyle, Brendan	Gabbard	McEachin
F.	Gallego	McGovern
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	McNerney
Brown (MD)	Gomez	Meeks
Brownley (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Meng
Bustos	Gottheimer	Moore
Butterfield	Green, Al	Moulton
Capuano	Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)
Carbajal	Grijalva	Nadler
Cárdenas	Gutiérrez	Napolitano
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	Neal
Cartwright	Hastings	Nolan
Castor (FL)	Heck	Norcross
Castro (TX)	Higgins (NY)	O'Halleran
Cicilline	Himes	O'Rourke
Clark (MA)	Huffman	Pallone
Clarke (NY)	Jackson Lee	Panetta
Clay	Jayapal	Pascarell
Cleaver	Jeffries	Payne
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Cohen	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Connolly	Keating	Peters
Cooper	Kennedy	Peterson
Correa	Khanna	Pocan
Costa	Kihuen	Polis
Courtney	Kildee	Price (NC)
Crist	Kilmer	Quigley
Crowley	Kind	Raskin
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Kuster (NH)	Richmond
DeFazio	Langevin	Rosen
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
DeLauro	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Demings	Lee	Sánchez
DeSaulnier	Levin	Sarbanes
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
Doggett	Loeback	Schneider
	Lofgren	Schrader

Scott (VA)	Suozzi	Velázquez
Scott, David	Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky
Serrano	Takano	Wasserman
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Shea-Porter	Titus	Waters, Maxine
Sherman	Tonko	Watson Coleman
Sinema	Torres	Welch
Sires	Tsongas	Wilson (FL)
Smith (WA)	Vargas	Yarmuth
Soto	Veasey	
Speier	Vela	

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta	Hoyer	Mooney (WV)
Black	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Jones	Rush
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Walz

□ 1405

Ms. MENG and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ZELDIN was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF SEVEN AIRMEN KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY ON THE IRAQ-SYRIA BORDER

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, today we rise to honor the service and sacrifice of seven airmen fallen in the line of duty last week on the Iraq-Syria border.

There are no words that fully describe the profound sorrow and immense gratitude that consume us today. There are no words to describe the emptiness this loss leaves in the hearts of communities all across our Nation. There is, however, no shortage of ways to describe these seven servicemen: selfless, heroes, patriots, and everything we aspire to be as a people, as a nation, and as Americans.

These fallen airmen are the best of who we are. They are the embodiment of what makes this country the greatest in the world, the willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our exceptional Nation.

There is no doubt these brave men, and the so many who have fallen before them, are the reason we have the opportunity to stand here today in the well of the House of Representatives, in the heart of the United States Capitol, which should always serve as a beacon of hope and freedom for so many in our country and around the world.

Each and every day, these seven Americans answered the call of duty, to defend the liberties on which our Nation were founded, to defend their neighbors and communities, but, most selflessly, to defend the millions of Americans whom they would never know.

Four of these airmen served with the 106th Rescue Wing in Westhampton Beach, New York, located in the First Congressional District. This amazing unit is made up of the best of the best our Nation has to offer, with a long, rich history of service and sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the families of these seven great airmen have the unwavering thanks and appreciation of every American across our country, but, most of all, they have our utmost re-

spect. We stand shoulder to shoulder with every one of them as they go through, undoubtedly, the most difficult moment of their lives.

Captain Andreas B. O’Keefe, Center Moriches, New York; Captain Christopher T. Zanetis, Long Island City, New York; Master Sergeant Christopher J. Raguso, Commack, New York; Staff Sergeant Dashan J. Briggs, Port Jefferson Station, New York; Captain Mark K. Weber, Colorado Springs, Colorado; Master Sergeant William R. Posch, Indialantic, Florida; Staff Sergeant Carl P. Enis, Tallahassee, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of these seven dedicated, selfless, and courageous airmen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARPER). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 183, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

AYES—225

Abraham	Davis, Rodney	Hollingsworth
Aderholt	Denham	Hudson
Allen	Dent	Huizenga
Amodei	DeSantis	Hultgren
Babin	DesJarlais	Hunter
Bacon	Donovan	Hurd
Banks (IN)	Duffy	Issa
Barr	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (KS)
Barton	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (WV)
Bergman	Dunn	Johnson (LA)
Biggs	Emmer	Johnson (OH)
Bilirakis	Estes (KS)	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (MI)	Farenthold	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Faso	Joyce (OH)
Blackburn	Ferguson	Katko
Blum	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (MS)
Bost	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Brady (TX)	Flores	King (IA)
Brat	Portenberry	King (NY)
Bridenstine	Fox	Kinzinger
Brooks (AL)	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Brooks (IN)	Gaetz	Kustoff (TN)
Buchanan	Gallagher	Labrador
Buck	Garrett	LaHood
Bucshon	Gianforte	LaMalfa
Budd	Gibbs	Lamborn
Burgess	Gohmert	Lance
Byrne	Goodlatte	Latta
Calvert	Gosar	Lewis (MN)
Carter (GA)	Gowdy	LoBiondo
Carter (TX)	Granger	Long
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Loudermilk
Cheney	Graves (LA)	Love
Coffman	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Cole	Griffith	Luetkemeyer
Collins (GA)	Grothman	MacArthur
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	Marchant
Comer	Handel	Marino
Conaway	Harper	Marshall
Cook	Harris	Mast
Costello (PA)	Hartzler	McCarthy
Cramer	Hensarling	McClintock
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	McHenry
Culberson	Hice, Jody B.	McKinley
Curbelo (FL)	Higgins (LA)	McMorris
Curtis	Hill	Rodgers
Davidson	Holding	Meehan

Messer	Rooney, Francis	Tenney
Mitchell	Rooney, Thomas	Thompson (PA)
Moolenaar	J.	Thornberry
Mullin	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton
Newhouse	Roskam	Trott
Noem	Ross	Turner
Norman	Rothfus	Upton
Nunes	Rouzer	Valadao
Olson	Royce (CA)	Wagner
Palazzo	Russell	Walberg
Palmer	Rutherford	Walden
Paulsen	Sanford	Walker
Pearce	Scalise	Walorski
Perry	Schweikert	Walters, Mimi
Pittenger	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)
Poe (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Webster (FL)
Poliquin	Sessions	Wenstrup
Posey	Shimkus	Westerman
Ratcliffe	Shuster	Williams
Reed	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Reichert	Smith (MO)	Wittman
Renacci	Smith (NE)	Womack
Rice (SC)	Smith (NJ)	Woodall
Roby	Smith (TX)	Yoder
Roe (TN)	Smucker	Yoho
Rogers (AL)	Stefanik	Young (AK)
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Young (IA)
Rohrabacher	Stivers	Zeldin
Rokita	Taylor	

NOES—183

Adams	Fudge	Napolitano
Aguilar	Gabbard	Neal
Amash	Gallego	Nolan
Barragan	Garamendi	Norcross
Bass	Gomez	O’Halloran
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	O’Rourke
Bera	Gottheimer	Pallone
Beyer	Green, Al	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Peters
F.	Heck	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Brown (MD)	Himes	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Butterfield	Jayapal	Raskin
Capuano	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Rosen
Carson (IN)	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kennedy	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Ciçilline	Kildee	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Clyburn	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Comstock	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Connolly	Lawrence	Serrano
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Lee	Shea-Porter
Costa	Levin	Sherman
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Sinema
Crist	Lieu, Ted	Sires
Crowley	Loeback	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lofgren	Soto
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Speier
DeFazio	Lowe	Suozzi
DeGette	Lujan Grisham,	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	M.	Takano
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lynch	Titus
Demings	Maloney,	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Torres
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Dingell	Massie	Vargas
Doggett	Matsui	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Velázquez
F.	McEachin	Visclosky
Ellison	McGovern	Wasserman
Engel	McNerney	Schultz
Eshoo	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Españlat	Meng	Watson Coleman
Esty (CT)	Moore	Welch
Evans	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	

NOT VOTING—21

Arrington	Chu, Judy	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Cummings	Hoyer
Black	Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.

Jones	McSally	Rush
Kelly (IL)	Meadows	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Mooney (WV)	Vela
McCaul	Pingree	Walz

□ 1418

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO MODIFY AMENDMENT NO. 1 PRINTED IN HOUSE REPORT 115-613 TO H.R. 4566, ALLEVIATING STRESS TEST BURDENS TO HELP INVESTORS ACT

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-613 with the modification placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 1 PRINTED IN HOUSE REPORT NO. 115-613 OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 1, line 10, strike "and".

Page 2, after line 7, insert the following:

(D) in clause (vi), as so redesignated, by striking "clause (ii)" and inserting "clause (iii)"; and

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment is modified.

ALLEVIATING STRESS TEST BURDENS TO HELP INVESTORS ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 787, I call up the bill (H.R. 4566) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 787, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-65, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4566

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 "Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act".

SEC. 2. STRESS TEST RELIEF FOR NONBANKS.

Section 165(i) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5365(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), by striking "and nonbank financial companies"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "are regulated by a primary Federal financial regulatory agency" and inserting: "whose primary financial regulatory agency is a Federal banking agency or the Federal Housing Finance Agency";

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking "Each Federal primary financial regulatory agency" and inserting "Each Federal banking agency and the Federal Housing Finance Agency"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) SEC AND CFTC.—The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission may each issue regulations requiring financial companies with respect to which they are the primary financial regulatory agency and that have total consolidated assets of more than \$10,000,000,000 to conduct periodic analyses of the financial condition, including available liquidity, of such companies under adverse economic conditions."

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council under section 120 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5330).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 115-613, as modified by the order of the House of today, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), one of the most hard-working, enthusiastic, cheerful members of the House Financial Services Committee for all the work that he has done to advance this very strong piece of bipartisan legislation, which, incidentally, passed the Financial Services Committee again with another strong bipartisan vote of 47-8.

Now, the financial crisis led to questions, both domestically and internationally, about how to address financial stability and create a regulatory framework to mitigate systemic risk, all the while ensuring robust economic growth.

At the heart of this bill of the gentleman from Maine is a recognition that our economy can suffer when we get it wrong, when government attempts to dictate the business models and operational objectives of so many of our businesses. It is also a recognition that one-size-fits-all regulations can stifle economic growth and ultimately harm consumers and harm our constituents.

Current bank-centric standards and assessments to nonbank industries, such as the asset management industry, have needlessly saddled Main Street investors with increased costs while they are trying to save for college or retirement or some other important need, and this is perhaps no clearer than in this stress testing regime.

As a former SEC chief economist observed in 2016, who said that, in the current law, "stress test the big banks; and, oh, you might as well go ahead and do the asset management companies." That is his take of what the law says.

In other words, asset management firms that, again, our constituents depend upon for their retirement security or for their financial planning are now subject to bank regulations simply because they operate under the financial services umbrella, even though such firms plainly have legal, structural, and operational characteristics that make them very, very different from banks.

By the way, none of the asset managers had anything to do with the financial crisis that brought about the legislation that we are debating in the first place. For example, unlike banks, asset managers do not have access to the deposit insurance fund or the Fed's discount window.

If that is not enough for you, Mr. Speaker, here is more. Asset managers are legally separated—legally separated from the funds they manage, meaning that the asset and liabilities of the manager are distinct from the assets and liabilities of the funds.

On the other hand, the bank business model directly subjects the bank to the risks and obligations of its assets and liabilities. Again, applying a one-size-fits-all regulatory structure—in this case, a bank-centric model—is not only bad for the asset management industry, but, far more importantly, for our constituents that they serve, who choose to save and invest.

Registered funds are the investment vehicle choices for millions of Americans seeking to buy a home, pay for college, plan for financial security and retirement. Application of unnecessary, ill-suited, bank-centric stress testing requirements to register funds

and advisers will undoubtedly increase cost for these funds and advisers, and, ultimately, this gets passed on to investors without any corresponding benefits that we can discern.

The recent asset management and insurance report issued by the Department of Treasury confirms these concerns. The bill of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) would fix this unequal regulatory structure by exempting certain nonbank financial institutions that have not been designated for supervision by the Federal Reserve Board from the act's stress testing requirement.

Further, in the true spirit of bipartisanship, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for recognizing the underlying need for this relief and for working with Mr. POLIQUIN to offer an amendment during markup that allows the SEC and the CFTC to issue regulations to require certain financial companies they supervise to conduct periodic analysis of the financial condition of such companies under adverse economic conditions.

The approach is common sense. It is not one size fits all. It recognizes that the primary regulator of nonbank financial companies is better suited than a bank regulator to determine whether these stress tests might be useful to address risk. And it recognizes that, as a general matter, stress testing asset managers is difficult and often needless.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this great bipartisan legislation. I believe we have an amendment forthcoming from the ranking member, which I expect our side of the aisle to support. I am led to believe that, with the adoption of her amendment, she would support the underlying bill. I hope that proves to come to fruition, in which case we can have a very strong bipartisan vote on this bill.

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

□ 1430

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 4566, the so-called Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, which would make it harder for regulators to identify and mitigate hidden systemic risks at nonbank financial companies before they undermine our economy.

Last Wednesday marked 10 years since global investment bank Bear Stearns imploded as a result of its failure to manage risk associated with its highly leveraged balance sheet and exposure to the subprime mortgage market. American taxpayers were forced to come to the rescue to prevent the firm's collapse from spreading to other overleveraged Wall Street institutions.

The demise of Bear Stearns was the canary in the coal mine for the ensuing

financial crisis, which ravaged the United States economy, destroyed trillions of dollars of wealth, and put millions of Americans out of their jobs and their homes.

Democrats responded to the 2008 financial crisis by passing the Dodd-Frank Act, which, among other reforms, required rigorous stress tests of the Nation's largest financial institutions. The Dodd-Frank Act also gave the Federal Reserve Board the discretion to quickly intervene and stress-test firms that could pose financial stability risk.

If regular stress testing had been conducted on firms like Bear Stearns from 2006 to 2008, it might have revealed major threats to the economy sooner, giving both the companies and Federal financial regulators a better chance to take remedial action to avoid a catastrophic near collapse of the global financial system.

H.R. 4566 would eliminate the Federal Reserve's authority to stress-test nonbank financial companies, even in situations where the firm's designation as systemically important is pending before the Financial Stability Oversight Council, FSOC.

Additionally, the bill would weaken the Dodd-Frank mandate that large financial companies under the SEC and CFTC's purview conduct internal stress tests to determine the company's ability to withstand a recession.

Combined, these rollbacks would allow the Bear Stearns of the world to take on increasing amounts of risk while regulators are tied up in lengthy administrative processes.

As former SEC Chair Mary Jo White stated in a December 2014 speech: "Stress testing is an important tool routinely used by banking regulators. Implementing this new mandate in asset management, while relatively novel, will help market participation and the Commission better understand the potential impact of stress events."

I agree with Chair White's comments about the importance of stress testing and think that it simply does not make sound public policy to eliminate this tool.

Members of the asset management industry have also recognized that stress testing is critical to effectively managing risk. In a 2015 letter to the SEC, the Asset Management Group of the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, that is SIFMA AMG, whose members manage more than \$30 trillion in assets, wrote: "Stress testing is one part of an effective and coherent risk management process for asset managers, the objective of which is not to test for solvency or capital adequacy, but to complement other approaches in assessing investment risk."

In fact, in a 2015 survey of SIFMA AMG members, nearly two-thirds of the asset managers surveyed reported that they already stress-test their funds. It seems imprudent that Congress would repeal a requirement for

large interconnected hedge funds that may have 15-to-1 leverage to periodically determine whether they could withstand a down economy.

Moreover, given how rapidly failures at large nonbank financial companies can spread across the highly interconnected financial system, regulators must be able to quickly identify problems that could undermine U.S. financial stability. The Federal Reserve should continue to have the discretionary authority to step in to identify and mitigate systemic risk at any financial company whose failure could pose a threat to our economy.

H.R. 4566 appears to ignore that nonbank financial companies like Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, and AIG played a central role in the financial crisis. When these firms collapsed as a result of their failure to mitigate their own internal risk, their losses sent shockwaves throughout the banking system.

Stress testing these kinds of nonbank financial institutions provides a valuable early warning system for our economy and gives both the companies and regulators a chance to correct problems before they have catastrophic effects on our financial stability. That is why I intend to offer an amendment that, if adopted, would restore the Fed's discretionary authority to stress test any nonbank, provided that the test meet certain conditions, including approval by a majority of FSOC members. It would also allow the Fed to use alternatives to capital, as appropriate, when stress-testing systemically important nonbanks and broaden the SEC's and CFTC's authority to require internal testing for entities under their purview.

This amendment would ensure that large financial institutions, like investment companies that manage trillions of dollars of hardworking Americans' retirement savings, can be appropriately evaluated for their ability to survive in a stressed economy.

While I oppose H.R. 4566 in its current form, I would support an amended version of the bill that preserves the bill's ability to identify and mitigate future systemic risk at nonbanks before they lead to another crisis.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), who is the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time, and I thank the chairman for moving this very important piece of legislation through our committee, the Financial Services Committee, and onto the floor.

This is a commonsense bill, Mr. Speaker, that I encourage everybody, Republicans and Democrats, to support, H.R. 4566.

Throughout the great State of Maine and across America, Mr. Speaker, we have millions and millions of small

savers and small investors who are planning for their retirement or for the college education for their kids or their grandkids.

The people of Maine, Mr. Speaker, are the most honest and hardworking folks you can find anywhere, and every week thousands and thousands of Maine families are setting aside small parts of their paychecks into an IRA or a 401(k) plan so they will have enough money for their retirement, or setting aside small amounts of money for their son or their daughter to attend a college, a community college, a university, or a technical school.

Today, Mr. Speaker, almost 55 percent of all American families, about 100 million of our fellow Americans, entrust these savings to mutual funds and other pension advisers such that they are able to grow and to provide them with a larger nest egg down the road.

These asset managers, Mr. Speaker, are currently operating under the uncertainty of whether or not they will be subjected to very costly and, in many cases, unnecessary stress test regulations which are designed for large money center banks with very different functions in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, when a bank takes in deposits from its customers, it is obligated to return those deposits and, hopefully, with interest. Now, it is important that those banks have enough reserves to make sure that, during a recession, they are able to meet those obligations. For many of these banks, stress testing does make sense.

However, Mr. Speaker, mutual fund and other asset managers perform a very different function. If one invests for their retirement or their college savings, their goal is to grow that nest egg, but it is not guaranteed to be the case by the asset managers who are performing that job. In effect, Mr. Speaker, these asset managers of mutual funds serve as an agent for the investor and the small saver, with no liability to return these savings in full; but, of course, they take the risk for a better return down the road.

Now, if you do have a huge money center bank with tentacles running throughout the economy and that bank fails, it could represent a systemic risk to our economy. But investors in a poorly performing mutual fund are simply able to switch their account to a better performing mutual fund house in order for a better return down the road with no systemic risk to the economy, in part, Mr. Speaker, because the assets themselves are held at a bank custodian. They are not even held at the mutual fund company or at the asset management firm.

Now, my bill, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4566, exempts most nonbank financial institutions, like mutual funds, from costly stress test requirements. And this, Mr. Speaker, is so important to our small savers across the country because, when you have costly, cumbersome, and unnecessary regulations, they are

paid for by the savers in these mutual funds and by these pension fund investors. And when they are paid out of their rate of return, their rates of return drop, and, therefore, the value of their nest eggs drop.

Mr. Speaker, government should be in the job of helping our families live better lives with more financial security, and H.R. 4566 helps us do just that by removing one-size-fits-all regulations that fit for lots of banks but not for the asset management community.

Today, Mr. Speaker, approximately 4 percent of the expenses of asset managers are for complying with regulations. If we do nothing, that number is expected to go up to 10 percent of their expenses, just on compliance, within 5 years. Now, that makes a big difference because the higher the expenses, the lower the rate of return, the smaller the nest egg for those who are saving for college or for retirement.

To give support to my point, Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years, economists at our own Securities and Exchange Commission and at our own Treasury have not been able to design a stress test for asset managers and for thousands and thousands of mutual fund companies across the country, and that is because it makes no sense to try to do so.

Stress testing as a prudential regulation simply does not fit every participant in the United States financial services sector. There are intrinsic differences between banks and asset managers, and my bill, Mr. Speaker, recognizes that difference and properly exempts most nonbank financial institutions from stress tests. That, in turn, again, Mr. Speaker, will lower the cost and increase the rates of return for Main Street investors across our great State of Maine and across America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for the opportunity to address this very important issue, and I encourage everyone, Republicans and Democrats, both sides of the aisle, to please vote "yes" for H.R. 4566, Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle and my chairman, Mr. HENSARLING, for indicating their acceptance of the amendment.

I think it is extremely important for both sides of the aisle to appreciate the necessity and the importance of stress testing, and I think we both do that. The discretion that we afford to the Feds in this bill, I think, is very important. So this is one of those instances when both sides can come together and recognize that there were important indications of what is needed to understand what should be done to avoid another meltdown in our financial services industries and our banks.

Again, I don't think there is any need for us to continue to talk about what we don't like about stress testing, but,

rather, we are coming together to talk about how it is done and why it is important. I have a great appreciation for that, and I would like to thank my colleagues for that.

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

□ 1445

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), who is the vice chairman of our Financial Services Committee and the chief deputy majority whip.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for yielding time today on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act. It rolls off the tongue to some, maybe BRUCE POLIQUIN's, the bill's sponsor, but it is an important thing for us to discuss here today.

Now, hindsight bias is a very dangerous thing. It allows us to overstate our ability to predict an outcome, and it is something that lures us into creating a new system that while excellent at solving the last financial crisis or the last crisis, the last event, it fails to see the next event coming.

Now, it is not something that just fortune tellers use. It is not something that just those with an NCAA pool would use to say that all along they knew UMBC would beat Virginia. It is not just used there. Here in Washington, it is done by bureaucrats that are susceptible to these same fallacies.

So in the wake of the financial crisis, policymakers here in Washington raced to give regulators new tools to help predict future risks so that such a crisis would never happen again.

One of those tools was stress testing. The idea was to provide a method to test financial firms to differentiate between solid institutions that can weather a financial storm and those that would need help. But this crystal ball has flaws. One of the biggest flaws is treating all large financial firms the same, a one-size-fits-all approach, and this includes lumping in nonbank financial firms that don't use leverage with financial firms—bank firms—that do use leverage.

Despite this widely understood concept that capital adequacy standards do not fit neatly into assessing the risks of the asset management industry, for instance, regulators have instead stuck to their rigid methodology to try to square the circle, or circle the square, whatever that phrase is.

Thankfully, Representative BRUCE POLIQUIN has crafted a very solid bill to address this truth and bring it into reality legislatively. The stress tests built after the financial crisis do not work for nonbank financial firms. This is a security show rather than security in fact.

Thus, in a world that constantly throws big and unexpected events our way, understanding the limitations of

predicting risk is one of the most important steps we can take to avoid future harm, and that is what this bill does. I encourage my House colleagues to vote in support of and in favor of it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am just amazed that anybody from North Carolina, after being beaten by Texas A&M by 21 points, would make any allusion to basketball whatsoever. I trust our next speaker will not make that mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who is the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman can be assured that since my team was one and done, I will skip the bracket discussion here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) for his work on this very reasonable legislation.

Stress tests are a good idea that should be standard practice in any company. What is not a good idea—and, quite frankly, not terribly helpful in promoting systemic financial stability—is the cryptic and arbitrary manner in which stress tests are handled today.

Today, the Federal Reserve imposes these stress tests on all financial firms with more than \$10 billion in consolidated assets. This doesn't apply just to banks, despite the fact that the Fed is a bank regulator. This requirement to submit information extends to nonbank financial firms as well.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to walk you through what one of these stress tests looks like. A financial firm is given cryptic instructions to run a number of scenarios to test the fortitude of the institution. That firm then submits tens of thousands of pages to the Fed. In some cases, that number can climb to more than 100,000 pages at a cost of millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, to give you an idea of what 20,000 pages is, in our committee hearing, we had a visual aid there with a table about this size right here in front of me today, about 3 feet tall, and boxes all around. That is 20,000 pages. Some of these stress tests, Mr. Speaker, are 100,000 pages, five times that amount, hundreds of thousands—if not millions—of dollars to do these stress tests; and, quite frankly, there is very little evidence that the Fed actually reads all the paperwork. In fact, one day you will probably get a call from the Fed, and they will tell you whether you passed or not. It is a very subjective test. There is no real explanation offered if a firm fails. The message is just to try again and keep trying until you finally pass the test and guess what the model is. This is not a productive exercise for anyone.

The truth of the matter is that the Fed has no business conducting and

analyzing stress tests on nonbanks. Those firms have functional regulators, like the SEC and CFTC, which better understand the business models and performance of nonbanks and, as such, the risks those firms pose to the financial stability of the United States. The actual supervisor of these companies should be the only entity with the ability to require these sorts of activities, and Mr. POLIQUIN's bill allows for that.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about promoting thoughtful and effective legislation. It is about curtailing a one-size-fits-all—as the chairman mentioned earlier—approach to regulation, something Members from both sides of the aisle have claimed to support.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the gentleman from Maine for his leadership on this issue, and I urge support of this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), who is the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Maine, BRUCE POLIQUIN, for sponsoring this bipartisan legislation.

The Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act amends the Dodd-Frank Act to make some commonsense changes to stress testing requirements for asset managers and the investors whom they serve.

Congressman POLIQUIN has worked very hard to make sure this bill is bipartisan. In fact, he was able to win the support of two-thirds of the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee.

I believe this is one of the many bills that Chairman HENSARLING has suggested be part of our negotiations with the Senate on their regulatory relief package. I agree. Why shouldn't a bill with such strong bipartisan support at least be part of the conversation?

The idea behind the stress testing for financial institutions under Dodd-Frank is to make sure that they have enough capital on hand to cover losses in the case of a market disruption like the one that was encountered during the financial crisis. However, registered funds have a very different business model than banks. They do not guarantee any return to investors or promise that investors will get their principal back. Furthermore, these funds are not on the adviser's balance sheet.

The idea that an asset manager should hold capital like a bank does not comport with its business model. Or in the words of Mark Flannery, a former chief economist of the SEC, there is a false parallel for stress testing asset managers: "The parallel to bank stress tests is really extremely misleading. It is as if Dodd-Frank said 'stress test the big banks, and, oh, you

might as well go ahead and do the asset management companies.'"

Fortunately, BRUCE POLIQUIN has sponsored commonsense legislation to provide some regulatory relief in a way that I think Democrats and Republicans should be able to agree.

The Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act would eliminate the bank-like stress testing requirements in Dodd-Frank but would empower the SEC, the primary Federal regulator of the asset management industry, to require stress testing as it deems appropriate.

In short, what this bill says is that we should only stress-test asset managers as their primary regulator determines is in the best interest of the investors instead of arbitrarily applying bank-like stress testing requirements as proposed by the Federal Reserve.

It comes as little surprise that the SEC, including under the leadership of Mary Jo White, seems to agree. The SEC has not been able to come up with stress testing standards that are consistent and comparable with those of the Federal Reserve and other banking regulators, likely because there is no way to account for capital adequacy in these companies.

Furthermore, this bill does nothing to undermine the significant regulatory authority to the Financial Stability Oversight Council. The FSOC would still be able to make recommendations to the SEC for additional regulation of asset managers.

I am not necessarily endorsing this concept, but I would like to emphasize this in the hopes that it would encourage even more Democratic colleagues to join in support of this bill. This bill, again, is true to its name. It cuts costs that are borne by investors without subjecting our financial system to any additional risk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in supporting this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), who is the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to commend my friend and colleague from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) for his leadership on this important issue. H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, would help nonbanks not currently under supervision of the Federal Reserve from stress testing requirements.

In addition to alleviating burdensome requirements, the bill allows the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to issue regulations requiring financial companies with more than \$10 billion in consolidated assets to conduct a periodic analysis of their

financial condition, including their liquidity.

This legislation would properly tailor Dodd-Frank's stress test requirements in a way that is appropriately focused. This bill retains the SEC's ability to issue stress testing as it believes appropriate. The bill does not limit the Financial Stability Oversight Council's authority to request the SEC to adopt suitable requirements for advisers and funds.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank the gentleman from Maine for his commitment to this important piece of legislation. I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill on the floor.

In God We Trust.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), who is a hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4566, the Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act, which was introduced by my colleague, Representative POLIQUIN.

Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans rely on registered funds to invest and save for their future, and they rely on asset management advisers to assist them in making major financial decisions, such as paying college tuition, saving for retirement, or buying a home.

However, too often these advisers have their hands tied complying with burdensome regulations that were not intended for the type of financial institutions that they serve. Following the enactment of Dodd-Frank, a framework was created to assess systemic risk posed by financial institutions, and this framework looked at the risk from a bank-centric approach.

In addition, Dodd-Frank required all financial companies with total consolidated assets of more than \$10 billion to conduct various annual stress tests to comply with the law. Now, unfortunately, this broad definition sweeps in registered investment companies and requires that these nonbank institutions be held accountable for the same stress tests as banks.

This particular stress test does not make sense for the asset management industry and only adds costs that will end up putting the burden on investors who rely on these funds.

Again, the U.S. asset management industry is critical in promoting diverse investment and savings opportunities for individuals, for families, and for businesses. This important legislation would eliminate unnecessary costs for nonbank financial institutions that have not been designated as systematically important by removing Dodd-Frank's bank-centric, mandatory stress test requirement.

As we continue to explore new ways to help families save for their future or

buy a new home, we should remain focused on improving their ability to invest. I want to thank Representative POLIQUIN and Chairman HENSARLING for their important work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important bill.

□ 1500

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased about the work that staff has done on this particular legislation.

I do believe that we all agree that stress tests are important; it is a matter of who, how, and when.

Someone has likened stress tests to car testing, where, in the manufacture of new cars, you take them out on the road and you test them to see if they can withstand what they may be presented with in the terrain and with the kind of things that you would experience perhaps on the roughest roads that they test on. When they determine that there are weaknesses that can be corrected, that is what they do in order to make sure that this new vehicle that they are testing can withstand whatever the difficulties are that may be presented to them when they test a car.

That is what this stress testing is all about. It all about whether or not, in the event of a downturn in our economy, you have the ability to withstand the downturn, whether or not you have the ability to not only withstand what you are presented with in a downturn of the economy, but how you can fix what you have determined is wrong with what you are doing.

So I am, again, very pleased that we all agree that stress testing is extremely important and that we know what your concerns are about hedge fund and asset managers and all of that. But the discretion that we give to the Feds, I think, is very important. The fact that all of the businesses that we are concerned with will be doing their internal stress testing is extremely important.

So, again, I am very grateful for the acceptance of my amendment, and I am hopeful that, with this amendment, it demonstrates that, when we work very hard to reconcile our differences, we can do that.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that, with this amendment, all of the Members of the House vote for this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, I want to encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4566, the legislation from the gentleman from Maine. I want to commend him once again. He is one of our most hardworking members on the committee, and he cares passionately about his constituents in Maine.

I also want to commend him for once again working on a very bipartisan basis. He has managed to change his

bill from its original concept many times to try to garner more support from the other side of the aisle.

With the acceptance of the ranking member's amendment, again, I am hopeful that we will have a very, very strong vote in the House. Again, this came out of committee with a very strong bipartisan vote of 47-8.

Mr. Speaker, very often we debate regulation. I think that now, fortunately, we have a 3 percent growth Tax Code which has been passed by Congress, but, unfortunately, I do not believe we have a 3 percent growth of finance in the banking system.

That is important. It is important to our constituents who still need credit to buy that first home, a factory worker who needs to get their transmission repaired so that they can go to work, some parent trying to send a kid to college, or people trying to plan for their retirement.

Too often, I think we have a dichotomy between regulation and deregulation, when the real dichotomy is between smart regulation and dumb regulation. It is always incumbent upon us in Congress to look very carefully at these regulations. Sometimes they look very good on the chalkboard, but in reality, they don't quite render the results or benefits that we had hoped for. So we always have to take a look at what this is doing not just to consumer and investor protection, but what it is doing to economic growth as well.

I agree with the ranking member. Stress testing is a good concept. It is one of the reasons why banks and other financial firms typically stress-test themselves daily, weekly, monthly, annually.

What doesn't make sense, though, is that there be no recognition to the cost that it imposes, as the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of our Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee, was very articulate in reminding us that these submissions can cost us millions and millions of dollars. The reports are not measured in pages; they are measured by the pound. There can be 10- and 20-pound submissions of paper that we wonder if anybody ever reads.

But what especially doesn't make sense is trying to apply a bank stress test to a nonbank financial institution, particularly an asset manager. I know the ranking member was talking a little bit earlier about using an analogy to auto inspections: It makes no sense to have the home inspectors inspect your auto; it makes no sense to have the auto inspectors inspect your home.

The gentleman from Maine is ensuring that whatever stress test is applied, it is applied properly to the business model that needs to be tested for its potential stress of our financial system.

So, again, I just want to commend the gentleman from Maine for his hard work, and I urge all Members to vote in favor of H.R. 4566 because, indeed,

maybe it is not a catchy title, but it is an accurate title. As we alleviate stress test burdens, we do help investors.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUDSON). All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1, as modified, printed in House Report 115-613.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment, as modified.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Page 1, strike lines 8 and 9 and insert the following:

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (ii) through (v) as clauses (iii) through (vi), respectively;

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

“(ii) may conduct the evaluation required by this subsection utilizing alternatives to the capital adequacy test described in subparagraph (A), as the Board may determine appropriate;”;

(C) in clause (iii), as so redesignated, by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, provided that such tests of any nonbank financial company—

“(I) are requested by a majority vote of the Council;

“(II) are conducted in accordance with the company’s business model, including by utilizing alternatives to the capital adequacy test described in subparagraph (A), as the Board may determine appropriate; and

“(III) are not already required by the company’s Federal primary financial regulatory agency;” and

(D) in clause (vi), as so redesignated, by striking “clause (ii)” and inserting “clause (iii)”;

Page 2, beginning on line 10, strike “and that have total consolidated assets of more than \$10,000,000,000”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 787, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, in its current form, H.R. 4566 eliminates the Fed’s discretion to require stress testing on nonbanks that have not yet been designated as systemically important and weakens the Dodd-Frank Act’s mandate that the SEC and CFTC require nonbank financial companies under their authority to conduct annual stress tests. Together, these repeals create a loophole that would allow large brokerage firms and mega insurance companies to ignore risks while regulators are tied up in lengthy rulemaking or the FSOC designation process.

My amendment, if adopted, would restore the Fed’s discretionary authority to stress-test any nonbank financial firm, provided that the test is re-

quested by a majority vote of the FSOC, is conducted with consideration of the company’s business model, and is not already required by the company’s primary regulator.

My amendment would also allow the Fed to consider alternatives to the existing capital adequacy test, where appropriate, when conducting stress tests on nonbanks, including those designated as systemically important.

One of the key safeguards created by Dodd-Frank is the Fed’s ability to identify and mitigate risks in the financial system before they undermine the U.S. economy. By preserving the Fed’s ability to stress-test nonbank financial companies on a discretionary basis, my amendment will give regulators a better chance of preventing the next Bear Stearns or Lehman Brothers from dragging down our financial system.

Finally, my amendment would broaden the SEC’s and CFTC’s authority under the bill by striking the provision that would limit future company-run stress testing requirements to entities with more than \$10 billion in assets. This would ensure that the SEC and CFTC can require any financial company under their purview to evaluate their own ability to survive in a stressed economy.

While I oppose H.R. 4566 as currently drafted, with this amendment, the bill would represent a truly bipartisan effort to strengthen Dodd-Frank. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am not thrilled with the amendment, but in the spirit of compromise and the spirit of bipartisanship, we have worked with the ranking member and the sponsor of the legislation. It wouldn’t be my preferred approach, but that is often what we do around here.

I want to thank the ranking member for working with the majority side in order to advance this, again, as a very strong bipartisan vote in the House, which I hope and anticipate with the inclusion of this amendment.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, again, I am very happy. On the other side of the Capitol, they have recently advanced a number of kind of smart regulatory measures and capital formation measures. We look forward to negotiating with our friends in the Senate. I am hoping that an overwhelming vote on a bill like H.R. 4566 is one that could be in a final package before it goes to the President’s desk.

Again, I still think that, although we have all compromised a little some-

thing here, I think we all advance our principles. I think it is something that will help, actually, both financial stability and investor protection, including protecting their opportunities to have a better future.

So again, I want to thank the ranking member for working with us, and I would urge the House to adopt her amendment and adopt H.R. 4566 by Mr. POLIQUIN of Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, who says that a terrific Representative from one of the most urban areas in the country, Los Angeles, California, cannot get together with a Representative from one of the most rural parts of America up in the great State of Maine?

I thank Ranking Member WATERS for her extension of bipartisanship. I also thank Chairman HENSARLING very much for brokering this. This is going to be a great day for America, a great day for Maine, and a great day for California.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind words, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The question is on the amendment, as modified, by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The amendment, as modified, was 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. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 19, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—395

Abraham	Bera	Brat
Adams	Bergman	Bridenstine
Aderholt	Beyer	Brooks (AL)
Aguilar	Biggs	Brooks (IN)
Allen	Bilirakis	Brown (MD)
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Buchanan
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Buck
Babin	Blackburn	Bucshon
Bacon	Blum	Budd
Banks (IN)	Blumenauer	Burgess
Barr	Blunt Rochester	Bustos
Barragan	Bonamici	Butterfield
Barton	Bost	Byrne
Bass	Brady (PA)	Calvert
Beatty	Brady (TX)	Capuano

Carbajal	Green, Al	McHenry	Smith (NE)	Tonko	Waters, Maxine	There was no objection.
Cárdenas	Green, Gene	McKinley	Smith (NJ)	Torres	Watson Coleman	The text of the bill is as follows:
Carson (IN)	Griffith	McMorris	Smith (TX)	Trott	Weber (TX)	H.R. 4463
Carter (GA)	Grothman	Rodgers	Smith (WA)	Tsongas	Webster (FL)	<i>Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,</i>
Carter (TX)	Guthrie	McNerney	Smucker	Turner	Welch	SECTION 1. MABEL LEE MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.
Cartwright	Hanabusa	Meadows	Soto	Upton	Wenstrup	(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, shall be known and designated as the “Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office”.
Castor (FL)	Handel	Meehan	Stefanik	Valadao	Westerman	(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office”.
Castro (TX)	Harper	Meeks	Stewart	Vargas	Williams	
Chabot	Harris	Meng	Stivers	Veasey	Wilson (SC)	
Cheney	Hartzler	Messer	Suozzi	Vela	Wittman	
Cicilline	Hastings	Mitchell	Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez	Womack	
Clarke (NY)	Heck	Moolenaar	Takano	Wagner	Woodall	
Clay	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Taylor	Walberg	Yarmuth	
Cleaver	Herrera Beutler	Moore	Tenney	Walden	Yoder	
Clyburn	Hice, Jody B.	Moulton	Thompson (MS)	Walker	Yoho	
Coffman	Higgins (LA)	Mullin	Thompson (PA)	Walorski	Young (AK)	
Cohen	Higgins (NY)	Murphy (FL)	Thornberry	Walters, Mimi	Young (IA)	
Cole	Hill	Nadler	Tipton	Wasserman	Zeldin	
Collins (GA)	Himes	Napolitano	Titus	Schultz		
Collins (NY)	Holding	Neal		NAYS—19		
Comer	Hollingsworth	Newhouse	Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Sarbanes	
Comstock	Hudson	Noem	F.	Jayapal	Schakowsky	
Conaway	Huffman	Nolan	Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Serrano	
Connolly	Huizenga	Norcross	DeSaulnier	Khanna	Speier	
Cook	Hultgren	Norman	Ellison	Lee	Visclosky	
Cooper	Hunter	Nunes	O’Halloran	Pocan	Wilson (FL)	
Correa	Hurd	O’Rourke	Grijalva	Sánchez		
Costa	Issa	Olson		NOT VOTING—15		
Costello (PA)	Jackson Lee	Palazzo	Barletta	Hoyer	McSally	AMELIA EARHART POST OFFICE BUILDING
Courtney	Jeffries	Pallone	Black	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree	
Cramer	Jenkins (KS)	Palmer	Chu, Judy	Jones	Rush	
Crawford	Jenkins (WV)	Panetta	Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Thompson (CA)	
Crist	Johnson (LA)	Pascrell	Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Walz	
Crowley	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen		□ 1543		
Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Payne		Messrs. KHANNA, ELLISON, and Ms. LEE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”		
Culberson	Jordan	Pearce		Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MATSUI, Messrs. GONZALEZ of Texas, GENE GREEN of Texas, NORCROSS, Mrs. TORRES, Mses. CLARKE of New York, ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mses. SHEA-PORTER, CASTOR of Florida, Messrs. TONKO, ENGEL, TAKANO, and GALLEGO changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”		
Curbeo (FL)	Joyce (OH)	Pelosi		So the bill was passed.		
Curtis	Kaptur	Perlmutter		The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.		
Davidson	Katko	Perry		A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.		
Davis (CA)	Keating	Peters				
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (MS)	Peterson				
DeFazio	Kelly (PA)	Pittenger				
DeGette	Kennedy	Poe (TX)				
Delaney	Kihuen	Poliquin				
DeLauro	Kildee	Polis				
DelBene	Kilmer	Posey				
Demings	Kind	Price (NC)				
Denham	King (IA)	Quigley				
Dent	King (NY)	Raskin				
DeSantis	Kinzinger	Ratcliffe				
DesJarlais	Knight	Reed				
Deutch	Krishnamoorthi	Reichert				
Diaz-Balart	Kuster (NH)	Renacci				
Dingell	Kustoff (TN)	Rice (NY)				
Doggett	Labrador	Rice (SC)				
Donovan	LaHood	Richmond				
Doyle, Michael	LaMalfa	Roby				
F.	Lamborn	Roe (TN)				
Duffy	Lance	Rogers (AL)				
Duncan (SC)	Langevin	Rogers (KY)				
Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Rohrabacher				
Dunn	Larson (CT)	Rokita				
Emmer	Latta	Rooney, Francis				
Engel	Lawrence	Rooney, Thomas				
Eshoo	Lawson (FL)	J.				
Estes (KS)	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen				
Esty (CT)	Lewis (GA)	Rosen				
Evans	Lewis (MN)	Roskam				
Farenthold	Lieu, Ted	Ross				
Faso	LoBiondo	Rothfus				
Ferguson	Loeback	Rouzer				
Fitzpatrick	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard				
Fleischmann	Long	Royce (CA)				
Flores	Loudermilk	Ruiz				
Fortenberry	Love	Ruppersberger				
Foster	Lowenthal	Russell				
Foxx	Lowey	Rutherford				
Frankel (FL)	Lucas	Ryan (OH)				
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Sanford				
Fudge	Lujan Grisham,	Scalise				
Gabbard	M.	Schiff				
Gaetz	Luján, Ben Ray	Schneider				
Gallagher	Lynch	Schrader				
Gallego	MacArthur	Schweikert				
Garamendi	Maloney,	Scott (VA)				
Garrett	Carolyn B.	Scott, Austin				
Gianforte	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David				
Gibbs	Marchant	Sensenbrenner				
Gohmert	Marino	Sessions				
Gomez	Marshall	Sewell (AL)				
Gonzalez (TX)	Massie	Shea-Porter				
Goodlatte	Mast	Sherman				
Gosar	Matsui	Shimkus				
Gotthelmer	McCarthy	Shuster				
Gowdy	McCaul	Simpson				
Granger	McClintock	Sinema				
Graves (GA)	McCollum	Sires				
Graves (LA)	McEachin	Smith (MO)				
Graves (MO)	McGovern					

There was no objection.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4463

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

SECTION 1. MABEL LEE MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, shall be known and designated as the “Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office”.

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

AMELIA EARHART POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (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”, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2040

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

SECTION 1. AMELIA EARHART POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 621 Kansas Avenue in Atchison, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the “Amelia Earhart Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Amelia Earhart Post Office Building”.

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

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS PRIMARY SPONSOR OF H.R. 756

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the primary sponsor of H.R. 756, a bill originally introduced by Representative Chaffetz of Utah, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprints pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MABEL LEE MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4463) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the “Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office”, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

BRAIN INJURY AWARENESS DAY

(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, today is Brain Injury Awareness Day, and I welcome those who are in Washington today to share their stories.

This issue is near and dear to my heart. For nearly 30 years, this was my area of practice and expertise as a therapist and rehabilitation services manager. I served as a board member for the Brain Injury Association of Pennsylvania and helped form a brain injury support group.

The theme for this year's campaign is Change Your Mind. This public awareness campaign strives to destigmatize brain injury; empower those who have survived, as well as their caregivers; and promote the many types of support available.

The need to raise awareness is great. More than 2.8 million Americans sustain traumatic brain injuries in the United States each year.

The 13 million Americans living with brain injuries want what we all want: to be defined by who they are as people, not by their injury.

Mr. Speaker, everyone recovers at a different pace, and we should do everything in our power to support and encourage brain injury survivors. They deserve no less.

GET SCREENED FOR COLON
CANCER

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge each of my colleagues and the American people to talk to their doctors about getting screened for colorectal cancer.

Each year, I sponsor a resolution to recognize March as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month. By raising awareness about this preventable cancer, we can save lives.

During this Congress, Representative CHARLIE DENT and I introduced H.R. 1017, the Removing Barriers to Colorectal Cancer Screening Act of 2017. This bill would eliminate surprise out-of-pocket costs for Medicare beneficiaries who have polyps removed during colonoscopies.

I also introduced H.R. 1578, the Donald Payne Sr. Colorectal Cancer Detection Act of 2017, which would expand Medicare to cover certain blood-based colorectal cancer screening tests.

Named after my father, who passed away from colorectal cancer, this bipartisan legislation would significantly increase colorectal cancer detection and treatment.

Each year, I lead the appropriations letter to increase the funding for CDC colon cancer research.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me on these important bills. Together, we can save lives from colorectal cancer.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, President Trump has declared today to be National Agriculture Day, a time of celebration and gratefulness to our Nation's farmers and ranchers. Whether we realize it or not, agriculture is a part of all of our daily lives from morning until night. In fact, each American farmer feeds over 144 people, providing vital nutrition, and helping us better connect with our God-given resources.

Every \$1 of United States agricultural products and food exports creates another \$1.27 in business activity. Our country's agricultural exports are valued at more than \$100 billion, including \$4 billion from my own home State of Florida. Every \$1 billion in exports supports approximately 8,000 American jobs. That is over 8 million jobs created by agriculture.

While celebrations such as these mark tremendous achievements for U.S. agriculture, we must continue to construct policies that supports and strengthens all of our farmers and ranchers. As lawmakers, let us make this celebration a time of action and work towards initiatives that continually uplift our ag industry.

HONORING SHANTHI
VISWANATHAN

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mrs. Shanthi Viswanathan, a teacher at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, whose quick thinking saved lives.

As the second alarm went off that day, Mrs. Viswanathan knew something was wrong and she locked the classroom door, telling her students to take cover.

When the SWAT team arrived and asked her to let them in, she would not because she didn't want to risk falling for a gunman's trick. Instead, she told them: "Knock it down or open it with a key."

When Mrs. Viswanathan knew there was danger, she exemplified the truest form of the Hindu concept of dharma, of duty, in protecting those she was responsible for.

These actions were brought to my attention by the Hindu American Foundation, which continues to support the victims of the shooting as part of their broader commitment to Ahimsa, the Hindu concept of nonviolence.

They have also pursued various measures of gun control, which I

wholeheartedly support. I commend them for their efforts here.

Thank you to Mrs. Viswanathan and the Hindu American Foundation for their exemplary work and for making America a better place.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the eighth anniversary of the Affordable Care Act.

Since it was signed into law, Americans have relied on the ACA for access to quality, affordable healthcare; but Republicans have attacked Americans' healthcare at every turn.

Last year, Republicans tried to pass TrumpCare, a bill that would have imposed a crippling age tax, raised out-of-pocket costs, and increased the number of uninsured Americans by 23 million.

After the American people stopped TrumpCare in its tracks, Republicans went after the Affordable Care Act again in their tax scam. On top of that, the administration waged a persistent campaign to discourage people from enrolling in the ACA plans.

Despite GOP sabotage, Americans still signed up for the Affordable Care Act. Americans want better, more affordable healthcare, and that is what Democrats offer: A Better Deal for better healthcare.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TERESA
KIMURA

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Teresa Kimura.

Teresa traveled to the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1 with six of her friends. She was known for making every gathering an amazing experience.

Teresa worked at the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration.

She is remembered for her big heart, love of life, beautiful spirit, and infectious laugh.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address

you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I come before this floor to address a topic that has been front and center in this country since 1973: when the Supreme Court came down with the decisions known as *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, then the subsequent case in the early 1990s, *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.

This is a nation that has traditionally—and from the very beginning of the very first founding document, the Declaration of Independence—respected and revered life.

As our Founding Fathers put that language together, and as John Adams coached Thomas Jefferson, and Thomas Jefferson put his pen to the Declaration of Independence: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, 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.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, it wasn’t an accident that the order of these rights that come from God be started out with life, then liberty, then the pursuit of happiness.

Of all the scholars that I have talked to and the times that I have sat in the classroom and in my readings, it just never really claim clear. It is not educating our young people about what they were thinking about when they drafted that language in the Declaration: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights,” but the right to life is listed first. It is not second or third.

They didn’t put together a list of four or five or seven or ten different rights. They laid three out in the Declaration. And those three start with life, because life is the most paramount right.

The former Governor of Pennsylvania, Governor BOB CASEY, a Democrat, who has since passed away, was denied an opportunity to speak at the Democratic National Convention some years ago because he was a pro-life Democrat Governor and he would speak in favor of life. He said this: “Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.”

The measure itself.

Now, what does that mean and how do we think about this, Mr. Speaker?

It would be this: when the Frenchmen devised the metric system, they set up a distance that was divided out to mean a ratio of the circumference of the Earth in whatever manner of calculation they had. And they came down to—however many times they divided that around, it came down to the length of the meter.

□ 1600

Then they produced this meter that was a platinum rule that was set at precisely the length of the meter. And,

in controlled temperature and pressure, at standard temperature and pressure, what would the length of this platinum rule be? Exactly a meter.

Now, how long is a meter? I guess I could tell you, we can measure it by other measures. We can do some comparisons. But that meter, that original meter made out of platinum that is maintained at standard temperature and pressure, that is the measure itself; and all other measurements of length that are incorporated within the metric system, all of those measures of length are in relation to the meter itself. That meter stick, the original one, is the measure itself against which all other distances are weighed and measured in the metric system.

Human life is the measure itself against which we measure every other value that we have because human life is sacred in all of its forms. And then, once we accept that and this Nation accepts that human life is sacred in all of its forms—Democrats and Republicans do agree to that, I believe, generally speaking, maybe even universally—but the disagreement comes in, well, when does life begin? When does life end?

We can look at any one of the pro-life groups that are here in this country. You can ask the priests and pastors around America: When does life begin? The most consistent answer to that question is life begins at the moment of conception, the instant of fertilization, the instant of conception. That language is threaded throughout.

I have walked into gymnasiums, or maybe a whole school, K–12, or maybe a high school alone, and I will say to them: You will be faced with a couple of questions in your emerging young adult life, and the counsel that you would give to your friends perhaps, or maybe you, yourself, you will have to answer these two questions: Is human life sacred in all of its forms?

And I will say to them: Look at the person next to you. Is their life sacred? And they will nod their head.

Look at the person on the other side. Is their life sacred? And they will nod their head.

And I said: And they are looking at you, and they are nodding their head at you, too, because everybody in here, your life is sacred. It is precious. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

So once we universally agree that human life is sacred in all of its forms, then we have the next question and ask the question: At what moment does life begin, at what instant? And that is that instant at conception, that instant at fertilization. The rational, moral thought and faithful reasoning comes to that conclusion.

Yet the Supreme Court, in *Roe v. Wade* and in the accompanying case of *Doe v. Bolton*, on January 22, 1973, brought down a decision that decided that liberty and pursuit of happiness trumped life. They concluded that a mother could decide whether that child was inconvenient, whether they didn’t

want the child at the time, and allowed for abortion on demand. Coupling the two cases together, they allowed for abortion on demand.

Doe v. Bolton wrote everything in the list that could be exceptions: it could be the mental health; it could be the physical health; it could be even the familial health of the mother, which any of this could be affected by finances themselves. So if you don’t think you can afford this baby, *Doe v. Bolton* lets you say: Well, it affected my mental health. It affected my familial health, so I decided to abort the baby.

And any abortion doctor could conduct an abortion at will, staying within this framework that was manufactured by the Supreme Court that turned the principles that are in our Declaration on their head. They no longer recognize that life is the paramount right that is delivered to us from God and that liberty is secondary to life and that pursuit of happiness is tertiary to life.

Now, think of this. If any of us, in our pursuit of liberty, would decide that someone’s life is in the way of our liberty, we can’t go kill them. We would end up in prison or executed in some States. We can’t go kill somebody because they infringe upon our liberty. Their life is more important than our liberty.

Neither can someone, in their pursuit of happiness, trample on someone else’s liberties. Our liberties of freedom of speech, religion, the press, assembly, the right to keep and bear arms, the protections that we have on a reasonable search and seizure, a jury of our peers, the States’ rights that are enshrined in the Constitution that are subordinate to the enumerated powers in the Constitution, that is all laid out within a beautiful framework that has never been done better anywhere in the world in the history of the world, but it is based on the prioritization of God-given rights. Life is more important than liberty, is more important than this pursuit of happiness.

By the way, to define pursuit of happiness a little more thoroughly, some of the young people are growing up and they read that and don’t give it very much thought. They say, well, pursuit of happiness is a fun tailgate party before the ball game; it is getting together with my friends; it is sitting down with my Xbox and enjoying the video games that are going on. Maybe it is just listening to music. None of those things fit the categories that our Founding Fathers envisioned when they put pursuit of happiness in the Declaration.

Pursuit of happiness was lifted from the Greek term “*eudaimonia*,” which is spelled E-U-D-A-I-M-O-N-I-A—because we are friends, Christina. *Eudaimonia*, the Greek term, means pursuit of happiness in this concept that our Founding Fathers understood, and that was that development of the whole human being, not a party at all, not a joke at

all, not a time necessarily of laughter, but it was a component; to develop one's self intellectually, develop one's brain power with a knowledge base that was as strong as it could be, and for a lifetime, to develop one's mind and develop it thoroughly and contemplate deep thoughts to develop themselves. That is the intellectual component of it.

There was a theological component to develop one's self religiously, which they did. Even though they were pagan, in my view, they developed themselves in a belief in a hereafter and in a belief in higher beings. It was plural for the Greeks, the higher beings. But they were developing their intellect. They were developing themselves spiritually and theologically and also physically.

They kept their bodies in shape, and they worked out and they exercised, and they competed in the sports that are the foundation of our Olympics today. All of that was wrapped up in the eudaimonia of the time that our Founders read and understood. Thomas Jefferson thoroughly understood. There is no doubt he understood the meaning of the word "eudaimonia." He just didn't think the American people would understand it, so he wrote in there, "pursuit of happiness."

We have just kind of given a short and a brief definition of that. We haven't given it the full respect it was intended by the drafter and, in many cases, the author of our Declaration, Thomas Jefferson.

So now that I have reset this, life is paramount and it is the most important, and any of us should be willing to sacrifice at least some of our liberty to protect and save the lives of others because those lives are that precious and that important. Any one of us who is in pursuit of our eudaimonia, our pursuit of happiness, should be willing to give up some of that in order to secure and protect the liberties—not only our liberties, but the liberties of others.

So a nation that is built upon those principles would also be a nation that would do most anything to protect the lives of the most innocent among us, our unborn, our unborn that don't have the ability to scream out for their own mercy. They don't have the ability to come to Congress and lobby for themselves. They are silent. They have no chance to make a noise even until the day that they draw their first breath, if they have the opportunity to draw that first breath.

But the tally for the decision of *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* on January 22, 1973, now has reached or exceeded 60 million babies—60 million babies sacrificed on the altar of choice.

Watching the prioritized rights that came from God, we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. Our Supreme Court got it wrong, and they set the liberty of the mother over the life of the baby. They set the pursuit of happiness, the eudaimonia, presumably, of the mother, over the life of the baby.

We have a hole in our society; not only a hole that comes from the heavy, heavy guilt of tolerating this throughout these years, but it is a hole that is a multigenerational hole: 60 million babies not born that would otherwise be living, loving, laughing, learning, falling in love, having babies of their own, worshipping, and raising their children with the values that have made this America a great nation.

But that is all denied this Nation. It is denied the world. The solutions that they would have provided, the happiness and the joy they would have delivered, intellectual firepower that would come from 60 million babies is denied to us.

And to go back and look and think, also, a good number of those little girls that were aborted since 1973 would have otherwise been mothers today. And to look at it generationally, and this is a back-of-the-envelope calculation, to take those little girls and predict that maybe each one of them would have had three babies, each one, that calculates out to be, Mr. Speaker, another 60 million babies—another 60 million.

So the population of this country would be something like 120 million stronger if the Supreme Court had believed and had conviction on what I have just described about the right to life being the paramount right—more important than liberty, more important than the pursuit of happiness, eudaimonia, the right to life.

When the Supreme Court made that erroneous activist decision, they started this country in a downward spiral, a spiral where there is less respect for life than there was before 1973.

Mr. Speaker, if I just take you to the school shooting data and address that, we look back through the history and the records of the school shootings as well as mass killings that have taken place in schools, look back over the last century, the earliest one that we could find was 1924, in Michigan. It was a series of bombs that were planted in the schools there in Michigan, set to go off by alarm clocks, which would be the kind that we would see in the old cartoons today. Those bombs were timed to go off, and the result of that was 40 people were killed in the bombings at the school in Michigan in 1924, mass school killing. That is the largest mass school killing that we could find by sorting through history as deeply as we could research it, 40 killed, bombings, 1924.

Then not another mass school killing or shooting, not another killing until 1940, when an individual went into a school in Pasadena and killed five people with a pistol. Then not another school shooting, mass shooting of any kind at least, took place from 1940 on. It took us all the way to 1963, 23 years after that single mass school shooting in Pasadena.

Twenty-three years later, the Supreme Court came down with another erroneous decision called *Murray v.*

Curlett. *Murray v. Curlett* is the case that took prayer out of public schools. Up till that time, we went to school and we went into school and started the day with the pledge and a prayer in the classroom with the teachers, especially in elementary school. I remember that clearly.

But by the time the *Murray v. Curlett* decision came down, I was a freshman in high school, and I remember that order. The Supreme Court commands no more prayer in the public schools. Where did they get the authority to declare that we couldn't exercise our freedom of religion?

Now, I have been challenged on this a good number of times in subsequent years, but I remember them saying: Well, what will you do about the separation of church and state?

Well, first of all, there isn't a separation of church and state, but it is being exercised by Supreme Court decisions as a separation even not only of church and state, but church and school.

Now, the First Amendment of the Constitution writes, and what it specifically does is it prohibits Congress from establishing a law that creates a state religion. And it denies the ability of Congress to pass that legislation that establishes a state religion, so that is all it does.

And the freedom of religion shall not be infringed. We have a freedom of religion, but they still, the Supreme Court, made the decision to take prayer out of the public schools, an activist act that then began to scrub faith and morality out of our public schools.

□ 1615

I remember that freshman year when I learned this. I remember in that classroom—and these images are in my mind clearly. It was: How are they going to stop us from praying in our schools? What could they possibly do to keep us from praying?

They hadn't invented duct tape yet at that time, Mr. Speaker, but, you know, I am thinking the white adhesive tape that doctors use, the medical tape, and I had images in my mind: Well, they could tape our mouths shut with that tape. We could pray silently. They couldn't stop us from praying by taping our mouths shut.

The only way to stop prayer in the public schools, if we refuse to accept the order, was to empty the schools out themselves. That image is in my mind. Denison Community Schools, where I went to high school, I can still see the central building in my mind's eye, clearing out all the rooms, emptying the rooms, all the students going outside, outside of that school.

And the Army. The Army is in my imagination—Vietnam era—that the Army would come in, and they would have a new chain to roll around those bars that you push inside the doors to open the doors, wrap that chain around there, put a new padlock on it, and post a guard, an Army uniform outside those doors, every entrance into that

school. That is the only way they could have stopped prayer in that public school.

But they stopped it because we accepted the order of the Supreme Court. We accepted the beginning of the degradation of the moral core of America that was being taught in every public school in America at that time.

We revered our faith. We understood our history. We knew that our Founding Fathers, who put this country together, who I believe were moved around like men on a chessboard by the hand of God—I believe the Declaration is written not with divine inspiration, like the Bible, but with divine guidance, just a little bit lower standard of proof. We are gifted in this country with the divine grace that God guided the men and women who built this country in the nearly perfect foundation that they put in place in the Declaration and in also the Constitution.

But we let the Supreme Court, that was never designed to be the most powerful of the three branches of government—we let the Supreme Court rule. And then, now, today, we teach in those schools that there is three equal branches of government. They are not equal. They were not designed to be equal. The Founding Fathers put them together that the judicial branch of government was designed to be the weakest of the three branches of government, and they were not even the branch of government that was designed to come down with a rule on what is constitutional and what is unconstitutional.

The Constitution requires that Congress establish a Supreme Court. And I had made this case to, God rest his soul, Justice Scalia, an awfully hard man to say goodbye to for all that he has done for our country and all the clarity that he has brought to the understanding of the Constitution. I am grateful that Justice Gorsuch is there to replace him in picking up on the things that are so well perfected by Justice Scalia.

But in a meeting with 30 or 40 other members here several years ago, I made the point, Mr. Speaker, to Justice Scalia, and I said to him that Congress is the most powerful branch of government, the legislative branch of government, and the House, in particular, because all spending bills have to start here, and the Constitution doesn't require that we establish all of the Federal circuits that are out there or the Federal district courts below that.

The Congress only—and this is how I put it to Justice Scalia—Congress is only required to establish a Supreme Court. We could abolish all of the other Federal districts if we chose to do so. In fact, Congress did abolish two judicial districts back in about 1802. That is a pattern. It has been established.

So if Congress decided to do so, we could weaken the judicial branch of government, and we could reduce the judicial branch of government down to

just a Supreme Court, because it requires that we—constitutionally, we are required to establish a Supreme Court. But there is nothing that requires us to build a building, fund a building, or to fund an administrative staff and team for them.

So I said to Justice Scalia: We could eliminate all the Federal courts, except the Supreme Court. We could reduce the Supreme Court down to the Chief Justice at his own card table with his own candle, no staff.

And I think it was a bit of surprise for the very glib Justice Scalia to hear that out of a Member of Congress, especially in a setting that was, I will say, quasi-public at least.

He thought about it for a little bit. I am not sure if he had ever thought about what I had presented to him, Mr. Speaker, but he thought for a little bit, and he said: Well, I would argue that you could reduce the Supreme Court down to three Justices because, otherwise, if you don't have anything but a Supreme Court Chief Justice, there is nothing to be the chief of. So I would argue for three Justices.

And I said: Well, Justice Scalia, there have always been too many chiefs and not enough Indians.

And we, more or less, declared a case ready to move on for further discussion.

But the point of this exercise, Mr. Speaker, is to make the point that the Court's power exists because Congress empowers it. And if there is a struggle between the legislative branch of government, Article 1; or the executive branch of government, Article 2; or the judicial branch of government, Article 3, I would remind the folks involved in any discussion like that that the branches of government were prioritized in the Constitution in the same fashion that the God-given rights are prioritized in the Declaration—life, liberty, pursuit of happiness.

In the Constitution, Articles 1, 2, 3—legislative, executive, judicial branches of government—prioritized because our Founding Fathers envisioned that there would be a struggle between the three branches of the government, and they wanted to set up a static power base so that they expected that each branch of government would jealously protect its constitutional authority, and there would be that tug of war, a struggle, ethically and peacefully, they hoped, between each branch of government.

That is why they put the checks and balances in place. They gave the legislative authority to the United States Congress, and the spending authority to Congress, and the initiation of all bills that initiate spending to the House of Representatives. They didn't give it to the Senate because we were to be the hot cup of coffee, and the Senate was to be the saucer that that coffee cooled in.

That is why we are 2-year terms here, 6-year terms over in the Senate, but they wanted a legislative body that

would be a quick reaction for us, a fast response for if things got out of whack, if they needed to be addressed quickly, then they wanted the House of Representatives to perhaps turn over quickly so that the House could respond to these issues in a fast way.

They wanted a judicial body, that legislative body that could sit back, maybe fold their arms a little bit, and wait and be patient and think things through so it wasn't just emotional. It was also kind of a hard-charging reaction force in the House, and seasoned by experience, I might add, Mr. Speaker; and a more careful, slower moving body in the Senate, which I think they clearly achieved a more careful, slower moving body in the Senate.

But one of those examples in modern day, when things went against the American people in the elections of 2010, around March 23, 2010—it was March 23—the final passage of ObamaCare passed out from the Senate and the House to President Obama's desk, and he signed that bill as fast as he could get his signature on it. The American people had rejected a Federal Government takeover of our health insurance, at least as a minimum.

And I long said that, you know, our soul is the most sovereign thing that we have, and the government hasn't figured out how to nationalize that yet. I don't believe they ever will.

The second thing that is the most sovereign thing that we have is our bodies, our skin, and everything inside it. ObamaCare nationalized a Federal takeover of the management of our body, our skin, and everything inside of it, took out of our hands the ability to manage our own health in a free market system, and the public rejected such an idea. They rejected ObamaCare.

On March 23, it passed and was signed into law. That election that ensued the following November brought 87 freshmen Republicans to the House of Representatives. Every one of them pledged and every one of them ran on the ticket to 100 percent, rip it out by the roots, repeal ObamaCare. That is the reaction of the public when this body here was not responding to the will of the people. They changed that over in the very next election, which was just months later, from the third month to the eleventh month as—so you are only—and 8 months later, the election had taken place, and we had 87 new freshmen Republicans on the way.

We didn't get as far as we needed to get. We didn't get it fully ripped out by the roots, as I wanted to do, but you can see the effects of that election to this day, Mr. Speaker.

That is how our Founding Fathers envisioned it would work—the House of Representatives to be a quick reaction force. They reacted quickly in the 2010 election. The American people weighed in. When the executive branch gets out of line, there are provisions there. If there is going to be impeachment, the

House has to initiate that impeachment. But over in the Senate, the impeachment doesn't remove a President from office.

I believe it constitutionally requires a trial in the Senate, but to remove a President from office takes a two-thirds majority in the United States Senate. I don't think they served us very well in 1998, when the impeachment went before the United States Senate, when William Jefferson Clinton was impeached by the House of Representatives, because the trial in the Senate didn't bring us a verdict. It put all the questions together.

And instead of asking the question, "Did he commit the acts that the House had indicted him for," and in a separate question, "Should he be removed from office for that," they jammed those questions together, and it gave some of the Democrat Senators a way out. They didn't have to answer the question, whether they believed he was guilty or not, so they never really heard the case and gave us a verdict on the conclusion.

It was inconclusive in the Senate. I think that the way they framed those questions that were voted upon by the Senators, I think it was a disservice to our Constitution.

But, nonetheless, there is a check and a balance. If an executive—if a President gets out of line, if his executive branch gets out of line, the House of Representatives can initiate impeachment. The House of Representatives can shut off all funding to that branch of government or—well, it wouldn't do that, obviously, but to a division within that branch of government, we could cut the funds to the funding to bring about the result that is necessary if we have the conviction here and if we believe it is prudent policy.

The House controls the spending. The House initiates any impeachment that might be required, and we don't want to ever exercise that unless it is judiciously done for good reason and good cause. And the Senate, the prudent group of the Senate, come up for election every 6 years, so they can sit back a little bit. Only a third of them have the level of apprehension that all of those who are up for reelection in the House of Representatives do.

But this balance, this check and balance between the three branches of government, was that the branch of government and the division within it—the legislative branch and the U.S. House of Representatives, the division within it was always designed to be able to control the other branches of government and, by the way, able to limit the United States Senate.

The reasons for that are why we are up for election every 2 years so the people would be sovereign. We the people are the ones who really do decide who is right in all of this Republican form of government, which is guaranteed to the American people in the Constitu-

tion. We are guaranteed, Mr. Speaker, a Republican form of government. But in this form of government, it is we the people; and we the legislators within the United States House of Representatives are the most accountable to the people, and, by that, we need to be the most responsive to the people as well.

I think history has proven that out. So it doesn't mean either that the Supreme Court gets to decide necessarily what the Constitution means. I will define what it means here, Mr. Speaker, and that is, the Constitution has to mean what it says. It has to mean literally what it says, but it has to also mean what it was understood to mean at the time of its ratification.

Every one of us takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution. Here, in the House, 435 of us; and over in the Senate, 100 Senators; and a good number of executive branch employees, a long ways down the line, take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Now, I take that oath seriously, and I carry a Constitution in my jacket pocket every day, as close to my heart as it can get, to remember what this means, what it means to me.

But I don't take the oath to support and defend the Constitution with the idea in mind that I am going to shift my oath and the meaning of my oath to conform to a Supreme Court decision that does not reflect the original understanding of the Constitution. None of us can take an oath to a living, breathing, moving interpretation of a document.

This Constitution, Mr. Speaker, this Constitution constitutes a contractual guarantee, an intergenerational contractual guarantee that this God-given liberty, as defined in our Declaration, and the Bill of Rights and the structure of our government and the function of our government, the enumerated powers that are in here, that this is an intergenerational contractual guarantee passed down to us generation to generation, and it can't change its meaning just because five Justices over there in the Supreme Court decided to change its meaning.

□ 1630

Now, I want to respect their jurisprudence and I respect almost all of the decisions that have come down, but there have been times in history when an activist court has decided that they are going to rewrite this society according to their whim.

I have always admired Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT of Texas, who is a former judge. He came to this Congress and he ran on this ticket. He has been to Iowa a few times, and he is coming back. He says this:

I found myself on the bench as a judge, and I was constrained to interpret the literal meaning of the Constitution and to interpret the literal meaning of the laws that were passed, and when I felt the urge to be a legislator, I knew my obligation then was to leave the bench and run for Congress.

That is what you need to do when you feel in your heart that you are a

legislator, when you reason that you can do more to contribute as a legislator than you can as a judge.

So LOUIE GOHMERT came to this Congress. Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT came to this Congress in the right way for the right reasons, to legislate, because that was his heart's desire, and that is where he believed, and I hope today he still believes, that he can do the most good for this country.

But the Justices that sit on the bench that decide that they can just ignore the meaning of the Constitution are undermining our God-given liberty. They are undermining the foundation delivered to us by the Founders. They are undermining the Declaration. They are undermining the Constitution itself.

I can think of a few of those decisions. The Kelo decision, where the Supreme Court ruled that private property could be confiscated, condemned, through eminent domain by a local jurisdiction of government and then handed over to another private interest.

Let's just say that there is a widow lady that lives in a certain section of town, and she wants to live in that house the rest of her life, but there are developers that own the rest of the land around her, and they want to put in a shopping mall. So they would come in and say to the lady: Hey, here is our offer. We want to buy your house.

And she says: No. No amount of money can buy my house. I am going to live in this house the rest of my life.

Well, in the Kelo decision, they went to government, and government condemned the property, took that property away from her. It was litigated all the way to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court ruled that local government could condemn property under the Fifth Amendment, the Fifth Amendment, which says "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

And think of this. They didn't say "nor shall private property be condemned and handed over to other private interests, without just compensation," because the Founding Fathers never imagined that government would have the audacity to condemn private property to hand it over to other private interests.

But the function of that decision was, and so now the effect of the Kelo decision is, the Fifth Amendment now reads, in effect, de facto, we say: Nor shall private property be taken without just compensation. They struck out those three words "for public use."

That is the effect of a Supreme Court decision, and it is an erroneous decision. It is a wrong decision. It doesn't reflect the language in the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.

The dissent was written by Justice O'Connor. I didn't know until after I had made my statement on the floor after that decision that her dissent mirrored almost exactly the statement

that I made on the floor in rejection of it. I didn't expect the gentleman at that time from Massachusetts, Barney Frank, to agree with me either, but Barney Frank, Justice O'Connor, STEVE KING, and many others agreed: an erroneous decision.

A Supreme Court amended the Constitution, in effect. They de facto amended the Constitution of the United States by coming down with a decision that effectively struck the words "for public use" out of the Fifth Amendment, "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

So now there are extra constitutional takings of private property handed over to private property because local government has concluded they can collect more tax dollars off of that private interest that wants to build a shopping mall or a truck stop or whatever it might be to expand. That is the kind of decision that a Supreme Court can make that are activist decisions that effectively amend our Constitution if we let them do that.

So we think of a decision like *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*. How did they cook that up? Where does that come from?

Well, it comes from out of the emanations and penumbras, Madam Speaker, and it is rooted back in a decision called the *Griswold* decision from the sixties. I believe it was 1964.

Connecticut, at that time, a strong Catholic State, had decided that they would not allow for contraceptives to be sold in Connecticut. The *Griswold* couple, husband and wife, decided that they had a right to privacy to purchase contraceptives to exercise their liberties.

Now, that decision that was made by the State of Connecticut not to sell contraceptives was a part of the laboratory of the States. It is a State's right to pass a decision like that; and as soon as the people in the State of Connecticut decided they rejected that decision, they can elect some new people to their legislature.

But this was litigated to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court of the United States decided that that couple, the *Griswold* couple, had a right to privacy, and that right to privacy included the right to purchase contraceptives.

So they created a new right, a right to privacy. They created it out of thin air, which we now call out of the emanations and penumbras. That is a little shadow around the edge of the cloud that maybe a Justice in a black robe can see but the rest of us lay people or even the brightest attorneys in the land can't quite see because they aren't seated on the Supreme Court.

Well, if you can find rights out of the emanations and penumbras that you can't find in the very language of the Constitution or statute, for that matter, you are an activist judge, and you are trying to alter our society, amend our society into your own fashion. You are legislating from the bench.

So they created a right to privacy, and this right to privacy was then used as the foundation of the decision in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* that granted, those two cases together, abortion on demand—abortion on demand, at least before viability. And viability is a very vague measure of a baby that would be able to survive outside the womb.

Now, that length of maturity within the womb and the ability to survive outside the womb has changed substantially, Madam Speaker, since *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*. Now we have babies who survive clear down as early as into the 20th week. Viability has changed because medicine has gotten ahead of this, and we have saved more babies.

But viability wasn't the only measure, because *Doe v. Bolton* gave all the exceptions that I talked about earlier, made exceptions for the health of the mother, the physical health, the mental health, the familial health, the financial health, anything that might affect her psyche. So it amounts to abortion on demand for the sake of, well, let's wait until it is convenient to take the life of that innocent little baby.

But what we see now, Madam Speaker, what we see now is that we are watching these babies grow in the womb and the ultrasound. My iPhone has a number of little babies and the ultrasounds in it, and you can watch as those little babies will squirm and reach their arm out, suck their thumb. They look like they are trying to talk, stretch their legs out. They move around a lot more than we ever thought they did.

I have talked to mothers who say as they watch their little baby that is 19, 20 weeks along, squirming around in the ultrasound, that a lot of the time they can't yet feel that movement. We know that as we get later on, even us dads get to feel that movement, and it is a glorious thing. This is the development of a miracle, and you can't be a parent or a grandparent and hold a little baby that is flesh of your flesh and not be amazed at the miracle of a little baby.

When I took my firstborn in my hands, little David STEVEN KING, and put him in my hands and looked at him, it was with awe that I saw so many pieces about him: counted the fingers and toes, took a look at his eyes, saw every little feature that is there, that little son.

And I began to ask that question shortly after his birth: Could anyone take his life now within minutes after he was born? As squirmy and beautiful and miraculous, created in God's image as he was, could anybody take his life then? I don't know anybody who would be ghastly enough who could do so.

So I thought, if he is 20 minutes old and we can't take his life, if he is 5 minutes old and we can't take his life, if he is 1 minute old and we can't take his life, how could we take it a minute before he was born? or 5 minutes? or an

hour? or a day? or a week? or a month? Where along this continuum from this moment of conception would there be a time that we could say: Oh, he is only a blob of tissue?

He was never a blob of tissue. He was always a unique human being, joining together the DNA of his mother and his father in a unique fashion that would never be matched again.

Madam Speaker, think of this. Seven billion people on the planet, every one unique. Even the identical twins, the identical quadruplets that are there, their mother can tell them apart. Their father can tell them apart most of the time. And the older they get, the easier it is. But 7 billion faces on this planet, and God created those faces to be unique. No two faces are the same. Even if their DNA is matched up in identical twins or identical quadruplets or identical triplets, as rare as they are, their mothers can look them in the face and know which child is which. The rest of us can figure out everybody else, and we can, a lot of times, figure out the twins, too.

I have twin nieces that I could always tell apart. They would ask me how I could, and I would say: Well, one of you is really intelligent and the other is really beautiful. You two figure out which is which. I am not going to answer the question.

But we can tell them apart. Now, what a gift from God, the creation, to have the imagination to create faces, every one unique. No matter how many people on the planet there are, just the facial features are unique, let alone all the rest of us, let alone all the things that go on in our heads and in our minds and the experiences we have, the personalities that develop differently. That combination of nature or nurture that we will never unlock the mystery of that, that is all a gift from God.

We have aborted 60 million of the gifts from God—60 million—and another 60 million babies not born because their mothers were aborted. Children who never had the opportunity to live to draw that first breath of free air.

When I welcome a new grandchild into the world, I say a prayer over them, Madam Speaker, and I pray that they have a long and a healthy life, a faithful life, and a life that is long and healthy and faithful. And when that day comes that they are called home at the end of that long and healthy and faithful life, I pray that the last breath that they draw is more free than the first breaths that they are drawing on that day. And that is what we need to work for: more freedom, more God-given liberty, more young lives brought into this world.

The very source of all joy comes from little babies, from our children, and if we stopped having babies, the joy would finally just die down. The laughter, the giggling would just diminish day by day by day until there was no joy left in the world, because that is the source of it. And yet we are aborting 1 million babies a year.

That is why, Madam Speaker, I brought the Heartbeat bill to this House of Representatives, H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act. That is why we have worked so hard to get cosponsors on this legislation, we worked so hard to get the cosponsors.

People like former majority leader Tom DeLay came here to work pro bono. The leader of Faith2Action, Janet Porter, a driving force, worked to get cosponsors on this legislation, worked to send the messages in the right place. We carefully drafted language that reflects our intent to save the lives of as many babies as we can from the moment of the heartbeat.

We require that, if the abortionist is intending to commit an abortion, he must first check for a heartbeat, and that heartbeat would be detected at 7 to 8 weeks. If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected, because we know that is a unique human being, a sacred human life.

□ 1645

I would like to go back to the moment of conception, but we can't yet medically identify that moment. But we can identify when a heartbeat can be detected. We all know that if there is a beating heart, there is a baby there. That heart doesn't just sit down there on its own beating away. It is in the chest of a baby, a little baby, a little unique boy or a girl who is a gift from God. That baby has at least a 95 percent chance of successful birth once we can detect that heartbeat in the womb.

So how could we allow for the ending of that unique human being's life without that baby ever having a chance to draw a breath of free air or to scream for its own mercy? How could we say no to that? How could we have in our earpieces that ultrasound of that beating heart?

That little granddaughter is 20 weeks along and her heart was beating last week, anyway, at 161 beats per minute. That beat is strong, firm, and solid. She has at least a 95 percent chance of successful birth and being welcomed into this world drawing that breath of free air, and I will pray as freely still on her last day many, many years from now.

But we need to get there. We need to protect these lives, and we need to get a bill before the Supreme Court. So here in this House, we are 170 cosponsors strong. We are far ahead of any other significant piece of pro-life legislation. I drafted the bill with the strategy in mind, Madam Speaker, to get the Heartbeat bill before the Supreme Court after the next appointment to the Supreme Court.

I am very pleased with what I see with Neil Gorsuch. When I hear the rumors of the potential retirements in the Supreme Court, our three oldest members of the Supreme Court are 84, 80, and 78 years old, Madam Speaker. So we can expect a retirement fairly soon. We need to have a bill out of the

House of Representatives sitting on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk long enough and hard enough that we can gin up the effort to get it passed out of the United States Senate.

There are four windows that need to be open before we can start to save lives in significant numbers, Madam Speaker. One of them is a pro-life majority in the House of Representatives. We have that, 237 votes behind the pain-capable 20-week bill.

The next one is a pro-life majority in the United States Senate. Senator ROY BLUNT made mention in our values team here a couple of weeks ago that they have a bare majority, a pro-life majority in the Senate. Fifty-one votes voted for the 20-week bill over there. They didn't break the filibuster, but 51. That is a pro-life majority. If they suspend the rules over there and get rid of the filibuster rule, the votes are there to pass Heartbeat bill over and send it to the President's desk. That is the third window.

The first window is a pro-life majority in the House. The second window is a pro-life majority in the Senate. The third window is a President who will sign the Heartbeat bill to protect these lives from the seventh or eighth week all the way through. I don't have any doubt President Trump will sign such a bill, and I don't have any doubt that Vice President PENCE will be standing right next to him when that day comes. I don't know whether I am going to be standing there, but I am going to do everything I can, Madam Speaker, to get the Heartbeat bill to the President's desk.

Yes, it will be litigated. The pro-abortion people will litigate everything that slows down the abortion mills in this country. So it would be litigated. And the timing of getting it out of the Senate to the President's desk and before the Court after the next confirmation means we are called upon to move the Heartbeat bill out of the House within the next few months because as we get closer to the election, it gets harder. Things get crazy around here. So if it gets passed around July, it is going to be really hard to move the Heartbeat bill.

There is a little rule that was handed down, I think, from the previous Speaker that says that pro-life legislation doesn't move off the floor of the House unless the top three pro-life organizations support it and will actively support it here in the House of Representatives.

Those organizations would be Family Research Council. Tony Perkins supports the bill. The next organization is Susan B. Anthony List. They also have agreed to support the bill. Yes, they have a priority they would like to have move ahead of that, but Marjorie Dannenfelser said:

Of course, I would never stand in the way of something so good as the Heartbeat bill.

The third organization is the one that is not fully on board. In fact, I don't see that they are supporting it in

any way, and back channel says to me that there are some statements made to try to slow it down. That is the National Right to Life, the oldest and the largest pro-life organization in the United States of America. They said that they don't oppose the Heartbeat bill.

Madam Speaker, this is right off of their electronic publication, whether it happens to be a tweet or whether it is their website, but here is their statement: National Right to Life, protecting life in America since 1968.

National Right to Life says they do not oppose the Heartbeat bill. I struck through there with a red line and said: Well, neither do they support it. They don't oppose the Heartbeat bill. Well, they don't support the Heartbeat bill.

They are stuck on this. They are hidebound on this. Their mission statement says that they support and protect life from the beginning of life until natural death. They define the beginning of life at the moment of fertilization.

So how can you be National Right to Life and not support the Heartbeat bill?

Their reasoning is that they are stuck in this. They refuse to challenge the Supreme Court. They refuse to challenge the viability standards that were written into *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.

If the number one pro-life organization refuses to challenge the Supreme Court on those standards, then what they are really doing is accepting—and some would say accepting the idea that we are going to see 1 million abortions a year in this country, as far as the eye can see, because if you are not willing to challenge the Supreme Court, then you are accepting 1 million abortions.

That is what we get if we are trimming around the edges with pain-capable at 20 weeks. I support all of this legislation. Let's do it all, Madam Speaker. The pain-capable doesn't get the job done. It shies away from challenging the Supreme Court.

We wrote this Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490, in order to challenge the viability standard the Supreme Court has. We want to measure life—unique, precious, sacred human life—from the moment of conception until natural death, protected. By the way, protected in the 14th Amendment. We are all protected in there: life, liberty, and property. So all we need to do is define when life begins, and we are obligated by the Constitution to protect that life.

But the Supreme Court has different ideas. I don't believe they will after the next appointment to the Supreme Court.

So some of the people who agree with National Right to Life have said that not enough States have passed it. Okay. So we went to work. Here are the States that have passed heartbeat protection language: Ohio, North Dakota, and Arkansas.

Now, John Kasich vetoed that legislation.

Who lobbied him to do that?

The arm of National Right to Life and Planned Parenthood; side by side, by the way.

What brings them to do that, Madam Speaker?

Because they don't want to challenge the Supreme Court. There is testimony that went before the Ohio Legislature December 13, 2011, that said: We don't want to force Justice Kennedy to vote "no" on a Heartbeat bill because then Justice Ginsburg might write the majority opinion. If she does that, she might take away the things we have gained. And we should not go before the Court and risk what we have gained.

I would argue instead that every time we have gone before the Court, we have gained. We gain something. We gain ground. The Court is sensitive to the movement of our society. They were sensitive to that when they ran up the Obergefell decision that imposed same-sex marriage on America. They decided American society was ready for same-sex marriage, and they gave us an extraconstitutional decision and forced it on everyone in America.

They must have been right because there wasn't a very big fight that was put up. But by their rationale, we are a lot more ready to protect innocent unborn human life than we ever were for gay marriage. Yet we need to get this legislation before the Court.

Tonight at 6 o'clock eastern time, 7 o'clock central time, there is a full hearing before the Iowa House of Representatives on their Heartbeat legislation, which has passed the senate 30-20. It went before the house. It has passed out of committee out of the house last Thursday night in the last hour that was available in what they call funnel week. Now this hearing is called for by the pro-abortion people who want to have a full house hearing. The witnesses will be lined up there. They will stand up for life tonight.

If the hearing goes the way we expect, I expect the bill will come before the Iowa House of Representatives and it will pass. Watching the expressions on our excellent and wonderful first female Governor in the State of Iowa, Kim Reynolds, I can't imagine she would do anything but sign it. I don't want to put words in her mouth. I am just anticipating a wonderful result.

I believe in 1 week or 2 weeks that becomes law in Iowa. Likely the pro-abortion people will litigate like they did in Mississippi on Mississippi's 15-week bill that we have just seen before today, an injunction that is going before the Sixth Circuit. The viability standards in *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and also *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* will be challenged in the Fifth Circuit on the basis of the Mississippi law. Then that means that the Iowa law that I anticipate also will be litigated.

Why wouldn't we send this standard over to the Senate and on to go before the Supreme Court?

H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act, litigated at the same time before the United States Supreme Court along with Mississippi's 15-week bill and Iowa's Heartbeat bill. That looks to me like a good result. That brings it from several different angles.

I would remind the body that there were three Federal circuits where the partial-birth abortion legislation was heard simultaneously. They arrived packaged up in one case before the United States Supreme Court, and life prevailed in that case, as eventually life will prevail in the United States of America.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2154. An act to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schafer Agricultural Research Center.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4304. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Vermont; Nonattainment New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Program Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0589; FRL-9975-16-Region 1] received March 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 Energy and Commerce.

4305. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Revision to References for Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Sector to Incorporate Latest Edition of Certain Industry, Consensus-based Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0472; FRL-9975-19-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT53) received March 8, 2018,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4306. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Plans; Pennsylvania; Lebanon County 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard Determination of Attainment [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0479; FRL-9975-00-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4307. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources; Amendments [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505; FRL-9975-10-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT59) received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4308. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lipochitooligosaccharide (LCO) SP104; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0080; FRL-9973-39] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4309. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Washington: Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R10-RCRA-2017-0285; FRL-9974-35-Region 10] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4310. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Logan Airport Parking Freeze [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0590; FRL-9974-96-Region 1] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4311. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Delta, Ohio Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0256; FRL-9975-46-Region 5] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4312. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Amendment to Ambient Air Quality Standard for Ozone [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0592; FRL-9975-13-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4313. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Trading Programs [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0215; FRL-9975-32-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4314. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revisions to the Regulatory Definition of Volatile Organic Compound [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0544; FRL-9975-37-Region 3] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4315. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluopicolide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0257; FRL-9973-44] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4316. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Implementation of the 2015 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone: Nonattainment Area Classifications Approach [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0202; FRL-9975-23-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT41) received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4317. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Kasugamycin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0519; FRL-9972-96] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4318. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010, 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.

4319. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a semi-annual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses during the period from July 1 through December 31, 2017, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6); Public Law 102-484, Sec. 1705(e)(6) (as amended by Public Law 104-114, Sec. 102(g)); (110 Stat. 794); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4320. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Energy, Department of the Interior and Department of Energy, transmitting a letter supplementing the certification to Congress, that the Department of the Interior intends to disburse remaining funds in the Treasury account in accordance with Sec. 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act, 30 U.S.C. 191, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7439(f)(2); Public Law 105-85, Sec. 3404(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-107, Sec. 1048(c)(14)); (115 Stat. 1226); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4321. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Consolidated Cruise Ship Security Regulations [Docket No.: USCG-2006-23846] (RIN: 1625-AB30) March 16, 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.

4322. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marine Casualty Reporting Property Damage Thresholds [Docket No.:

USCG-2016-0748] (RIN: 1625-AC33) received March 16, 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.

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. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 5336. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to limit the exemption from the registration requirements of such Act for persons engaging in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts to activities which do not promote the political agenda of a foreign government, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the disclosures of foreign gifts by institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 5337. A bill to amend section 3903 of title 31, United States Code, to establish accelerated payments applicable to contracts with certain small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. HANDEL:

H.R. 5338. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to repeal authority to make bonus payments to States based on performance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 5339. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BLIRAKIS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 5340. A bill to strengthen the position of the United States as the world's leading innovator by amending title 35, United States Code, to protect the property rights of the inventors that grow the country's economy; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. POE of Texas (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5341. A bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 5342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that the Internal Revenue Service responds promptly to Taxpayer Advocate Directives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 5343. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to nullify certain contractual provisions prohibiting or penalizing a pharmacist's disclosure of the availability of therapeutically equivalent alternative drugs, or alternative methods of purchasing the prescription drug, that are less expensive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 5344. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions which were formerly classified to chapters 14 and 19 of title 25, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 5345. A bill to designate the Marshall Space Flight Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide leadership for the U.S. rocket propulsion industrial base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 5346. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for licenses and experimental permits for space support vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 5347. A bill to facilitate resolution of environmental remediation and reclamation, resolve potential liability of the United States, and promote economic development in Lyon County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 5348. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to codify and make permanent the authority of the Secretaries of the military departments to conduct programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee):

H.R. 5349. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1320 Autumn Avenue in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Judge Russell B. Sugarmon Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 5350. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to award grants to benefit the Appalachia region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 5351. A bill to prohibit the enforcement of a nondisclosure agreement based on an individual's employment in the Executive Office of the President if the disclosure of information in violation of the agreement is based on whistleblowing; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 5352. A bill to provide rental assistance to low-income tenants of certain multi-family rural housing projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BARTON, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 5353. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and expand a program of surveillance and education, carried out by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, regarding infections associated with injection drug use; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 5354. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require United States-based foreign media outlets to submit semi-annual reports to the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 5355. A bill to amend chapter 77 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify certain due process rights of Federal employees serving in sensitive positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 5356. A bill to establish the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Foreign Affairs, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H. Res. 791. A resolution expressing support for the designation of Cesar Chavez's birthday, March 31, as National Border Control Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SOTO):

H. Res. 792. A resolution urging the Secretary of the Interior to recognize the historical significance of Roberto Clemente's place of death near Piñones in Loiza, Puerto Rico, by adding it to the National Register of Historic Places; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 5336.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5337.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes and

Article I, Section 8, clause 18—The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. HANDEL:

H.R. 5338.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec. 8 Clause 1

Article I Sec. 8 Clause 18

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 5339.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 5340.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 8, "to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Rights to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5341.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that 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 in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 5342.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 5343.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress Under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 5344.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 25, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 5345.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5346.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 5347.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . .

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 5348.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5349.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 5350.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 5351.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Subsection 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 5352.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 5353.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States;

Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides Congress the authority to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 5354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 5355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 5356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 25: Mr. FERGUSON.
- H.R. 173: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 307: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
- H.R. 392: Mrs. HANDEL.
- H.R. 613: Mr. HUDSON.
- H.R. 721: Mr. GRJALVA and Mrs. HANDEL.
- H.R. 754: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. ROSKAM.
- H.R. 788: Mr. PAULSEN.
- H.R. 820: Mrs. HANDEL.
- H.R. 959: Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 1017: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 1022: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 1054: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 1111: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
- H.R. 1150: Mr. BUDD.
- H.R. 1173: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 1192: Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 1206: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 1212: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1247: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1270: Mr. AMODEI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 1300: Mr. KHANNA.
- H.R. 1317: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1318: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
- H.R. 1478: Mr. AGUILAR.
- H.R. 1596: Mr. PASCRELL.
- H.R. 1602: Ms. BASS and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

- H.R. 1615: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 1661: Mr. EMMER.
- H.R. 1683: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
- H.R. 1861: Mr. BEYER, Mr. BERA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
- H.R. 1881: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 2004: Mr. ROSKAM.
- H.R. 2293: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
- H.R. 2345: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 2452: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
- H.R. 2683: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. MESSER.
- H.R. 2903: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. KHANNA.
- H.R. 3030: Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 3174: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 3192: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 3207: Mr. POCAN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 3528: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 3545: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 3617: Mr. COHEN and Mr. SOTO.
- H.R. 3641: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H.R. 3654: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 3694: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
- H.R. 3738: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 3767: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 3806: Ms. JAYAPAL.
- H.R. 3861: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 3871: Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 3913: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 3918: Mr. NORCROSS.
- H.R. 3969: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 4024: Mr. BIGGS.
- H.R. 4057: Mrs. LOWEY.
- H.R. 4119: Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 4143: Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 4177: Ms. PLASKETT.
- H.R. 4202: Ms. SINEMA.
- H.R. 4206: Mr. BUDD.
- H.R. 4221: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 4265: Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 4275: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 4392: Ms. SINEMA.
- H.R. 4471: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 4476: Mr. GIANFORTE.
- H.R. 4518: Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 4575: Mr. HULTGREN.
- H.R. 4655: Mr. DUFFY.
- H.R. 4659: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 4681: Mr. RASKIN.
- H.R. 4682: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WITTMAN.

- H.R. 4706: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 4732: Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 4734: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
- H.R. 4827: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 4841: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. DUNN.
- H.R. 4903: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
- H.R. 4916: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
- H.R. 4943: Mr. WOODALL.
- H.R. 5034: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 5052: Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 5076: Mr. CRIST.
- H.R. 5080: Mr. BUDD.
- H.R. 5102: Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 5126: Mr. POE of Texas.
- H.R. 5127: Mrs. TORRES.
- H.R. 5132: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. HANDEL, Ms. MENG, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. ROUZER.
- H.R. 5180: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. BEYER.
- H.R. 5199: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H.R. 5261: Mr. LATTA.
- H.R. 5275: Mr. YOHO.
- H.R. 5279: Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 5281: Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 5282: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. NORCROSS.
- H.R. 5305: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 5313: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BRAT.
- H.R. 5324: Ms. STEFANIK.
- H.J. Res. 122: Mr. MESSER and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
- H. Con. Res. 10: Mrs. HARTZLER.
- H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LONG, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BABIN.
- H. Res. 128: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. HOLDING.
- H. Res. 211: Ms. NORTON.
- H. Res. 307: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
- H. Res. 433: Mr. RUSSELL.
- H. Res. 763: Ms. MENG and Mrs. TORRES.
- H. Res. 786: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. DEUTCH.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2018

No. 48

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, teach us how to praise You at all times, constantly glorifying Your Name and expressing gratitude for Your prevailing providence.

Lord, thank You for sustaining our lawmakers as they strive to fulfill Your purposes for our Nation and world. Set them free from all fears, reminding them that You have been their help in the past and should be their hope for the years to come.

Forgive us all for duties unperformed, promptings disobeyed, and beckonings ignored.

We pray in Your merciful 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 bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator

from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SASSE 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO OKSANA MASTERS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, during Sunday's closing ceremonies at the Pyeongchang Paralympics, the American flag was held high by a special member of Team USA. Oksana Masters of Louisville, KY, was elected by her teammates to represent our Nation at the ceremonies, capping off her remarkable trip.

Born in Chernobyl with radiation poisoning, Oksana was adopted at the age of 7 and came to the United States. She underwent a number of medical procedures at a young age, including the amputation of both of her legs, but that didn't stop her. Regardless of the obstacle, she pushed through.

This year marks her fourth Paralympics. She entered Pyeongchang with a silver and two bronze medals, but this time, this talented multisport athlete set her sights on the gold, and I am happy to report that Oksana, once again, achieved her goal. She ascended to the top of the podium, not once but twice.

Kentucky is very proud of Oksana and all that she has accomplished. She is a fine representative of our Commonwealth and our Nation.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING BILL

Mr. McCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, on a totally different matter, the Senate continues to consider a bill that would strike back against the evils of sex trafficking. The topic is all too familiar to me and many of my colleagues who have fought against child exploitation for decades. In recent years, as trafficking has migrated from street corners to smartphones, reports of child sex trafficking have ticked up dramatically.

My friend and colleague from Ohio, Senator PORTMAN, has been especially committed to rooting out the cause of this crisis. He has built a broad bipartisan coalition in support of the legislation currently before the Senate. It is designed to close a loophole in existing law that allows websites to avoid responsibility, even as they knowingly facilitate trafficking. It would ensure that any institutions that are party to this reprehensible practice are subject to strict penalties—the ones they deserve.

I urge each of my colleagues to join us in taking decisive action for our Nation's children.

YEMEN RESOLUTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, later today the Senate will vote on a resolution offered by the junior Senators from Vermont and Utah. Their goal is to end U.S. support for the Saudi Arabian-led coalition fighting the Houthi insurgency in Yemen, and they propose to do this using provisions of the War Powers Resolution and the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act.

I oppose their resolution for two reasons. The first reason is that my colleagues' substantive policy aim is actually misguided. Supreme Leader Khamenei and his regime know what

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1799

their goals are: Preserving their rule, expanding Iranian hegemony across the region, and harming the United States and Israel. That is what they want to do. That is why Iran exports violence, intimidation, and coercion. That is why Iran expands its ballistic missile program. That is why Iran uses proxies, such as the Houthis, Hezbollah, and other Shia militias, along with cyber attacks and other terrorism, to meddle in Yemen, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Bahrain, and beyond.

During the Obama administration, America drew down our forward-deployed military and conventional force structure. We chased after a flawed nuclear agreement. We reduced our commitment to our Sunni Arab partners. Iran noticed our reticence and saw an opportunity. It expanded its support of proxies and built strategies to exploit the unrest following civil wars in Yemen and Syria and the rampage of ISIL into Iraq.

If this meddling is to be confronted, if terrorist threats are to be countered, and if arms shipments are to be curtailed, the United States will need the help of our regional partners. One key partner is Saudi Arabia. We have shared common interests for decades. We have worked together to counter Iran, support the Free Syrian Army, and combat ISIL. Today the support the United States provides to the Saudi-led coalition, including aerial refueling over the Red Sea, contributes to greater precision in their air campaign and actually leads to fewer civilian casualties. So let me say that again: Withdrawing U.S. support would increase, not decrease, the risk of civilian casualties, and it would signal that we are not serious about containing Iran or its proxies. The Houthi presence would continue threatening shipping lanes in the Red Sea. Iranian missiles would continue threatening Riyadh, and Iran would be further emboldened. That is why the goal of this resolution is bad policy.

But my colleagues' resolution is also procedurally mistaken. The expedited authorities they wish to draw upon are meant for removing U.S. forces from actual participation in hostilities, but our support for the Saudi coalition has not caused us to enter active warfare or hostilities in Yemen.

The Department of Defense and Secretary Mattis have made clear that U.S. forces are not engaged in exchanges of fire with hostile forces. According to the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense: "The limited military and intelligence support that the United States is providing to the [KSA-led] coalition does not involve any introduction of U.S. forces into hostilities for purposes of the War Powers Resolution or of section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985."

I support that assessment. The refueling of aircraft over the Red Sea does not equate to introducing U.S.

forces into hostilities nor does intelligence sharing. U.S. forces are not transporting Saudi forces into combat within Yemen by air, land, or sea. So the expedited procedures this resolution seeks to exploit simply do not apply here.

If Senators disagree with my assessment of the merits and oppose our support for the coalition, they have several legislative tools available to them. They could try to restrict funds through the appropriations process, amend the Arms Control Export Act for the licensing of defense services or the National Defense Authorization Act. Instead, we face a resolution which purports to require the President to withdraw U.S. forces from hostilities in Yemen—hostilities which we have not entered.

In a recent speech, Secretary Mattis explained:

History proves that nations with allies thrive. . . . Working by, with and through allies who carry their equitable share allows us to amass the greatest possible strength.

Imagine how challenging that would become if every advise-and-assist mission our forces undertake around the globe becomes subject to misapplication of the War Powers Resolution.

Thus, I oppose this resolution on grounds of policy and on grounds of procedure, and I urge our colleagues to join me this afternoon.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on a final matter, later this week, the Senate will consider an omnibus spending package to address a number of critical priorities, from rebuilding America's infrastructure to fighting the opioid epidemic. In particular, building on the funding agreement passed in February, the measure will deliver the resources and certainty that America's military deserves. To be specific, this legislation will provide the largest year-on-year increase in defense funding in 15 years. After years of disproportionate cuts to our armed services, Congress has begun to provide adequate resources to put an end to the harmful decline in combat readiness, to fulfill our commitments to American families who sacrifice through service—many of them in my home State of Kentucky.

For our men and women in uniform, this means a well-deserved pay raise. For our veterans back home, it means increased oversight and modernization in the Veterans' Administration care system, thanks to a record level of VA funding. Our warriors on the frontline deserve to be trained to the highest standards, as do the units that replace them. Now our commanders can work to restore combat readiness—and not a moment too soon. Threats around the world are only growing in number and intensity. By strengthening our investment in missile defense, by funding new weapons systems, by scaling up

shipbuilding and aircraft procurement, and by investing in our all-volunteer servicemembers, we will send a strong message to our allies and our foes alike that America's military is regaining dominance.

This week, my colleagues will have the opportunity to follow through and address the pressing needs of the defense community. I hope each of them will join me in voting to swiftly pass the omnibus, thus giving our Armed Forces the resources they need and deserve.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, while the Senate conducts an important debate today on Yemen, we continue to negotiate an omnibus spending bill. It will follow through on the bipartisan budget deal we struck in February that, for the first time in a long time, will robustly fund our military and provide substantial investment in our middle class.

For too long, the arbitrary and pointless sequester caps held back Federal investment in jobs, scientific research, healthcare, and education. They also handicapped our military and prevented long-term planning at the Pentagon. The budget deal paved the way to do away with the harmful sequester caps, and now the omnibus will put the nail in the coffin.

Negotiations continue between the four leaders. A few sticking points remain but we are very close to signing off on legislation that both Houses will be able to take up and pass by the end of the week.

Mr. President, on the omni, I agree with the leader. Hopefully, we can come to an agreement and pass it this week. It has some things no one likes, and it has a lot of things not everybody likes but most people like. The basic structure of it was a fair compromise, and, hopefully, we can come to an agreement. Our staffs are working really hard.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS HURRICANE RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would like to say a word about Puerto Rico. Today marks the sixth anniversary of Hurricane Maria's landfall on the island—the 6-month anniversary. We all know that the storm in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands was one of the most powerful and devastating ever to have struck those islands. There was terrible damage to schools, hospitals, water systems, roads, homes, and businesses.

For months and months, people didn't have electricity or clean water or cell service. Far too many people are still waiting for relief. There are 120,000 people without electricity. Hundreds of thousands continue to lose power on a temporary basis. Calculating the hours of lost electricity service, Puerto Rico has experienced the longest blackout in the history of the United States.

Tens of thousands are still awaiting permanent shelter, and 10,000 small businesses are closed.

Puerto Rico struggled with a severe debt and healthcare crisis before Hurricane Maria came to its shores. The damage wrought by the hurricane has set the island even further back, despite the valiant efforts of its people.

Congress has passed significant relief as part of the bipartisan budget agreement earlier this year. We have to make sure that the aid goes to where it needs to go and that we provide additional aid if it is required.

To the long-suffering citizens of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the thousands who have relocated to the mainland, we haven't forgotten you. We are here to help you. You are on our minds, and we are going to keep fighting to help you rebuild your homes, your communities, and your beloved islands.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, on the tax bill, I just note that, once again, every day the more people learn about this tax bill, the more they don't like it. Stock buybacks continue at a hugely rapid rate. Aid to workers is much, much smaller, and the American people are learning this bill was of, by, and for the wealthiest Americans and the most powerful corporations. That is wrong. We welcome the debate on the tax bill because the more people learn about it, the more they don't like it.

Since the beginning of the tax debate, Republicans have insisted their bill is about cutting taxes for working Americans. Even though the bill would direct 83 percent of the benefits to the top 1 percent, Republicans said workers were the focus. Even though they made corporate tax cuts permanent but let the individual tax cuts expire, they said the middle class would be the real winners.

Democrats warned that if you gave big corporations and the wealthiest Americans the lion's share of the tax cuts, those benefits wouldn't trickle down to employees and the middle class. We warned that corporations would do what they always do when they have profits—distribute them amongst themselves. Even though big companies like AT&T were already paying low effective corporate rates, they had been shedding jobs and investment for years even before the tax bill.

Unfortunately, our warnings proved prescient. Almost every day, we hear a new story about a corporation using

the savings from the Republican tax bill to purchase its own stock, called a stock buyback, which boosts the corporation's stock price to provide a reward for wealthy executives and shareholders.

Just this morning, the Kentucky-based chemical company Ashland announced a brand-new \$500 million share repurchasing program. And last night, the total amount of corporate share buybacks surpassed \$225 billion since the Republican tax bill became law.

Stock buybacks are a big reason why workers no longer see the benefits of record corporate profits. Why? Because instead of investing corporate profits in things that benefit the long-term health of the company and its workers—like higher wages, new equipment, research and development, or new hires—corporations spend the money on share buybacks.

In fact, stock buybacks were illegal until 1982, which is about the same time that wages stopped increasing with corporate profits.

Republicans dutifully remind us that companies are also handing out bonuses. Yes, a few. But let me highlight the disparity between buybacks and investment in workers: According to a recent analysis by Just Capital, only 6 percent of the capital allocated by companies from the tax bill's savings has gone to employees, while nearly 60 percent has gone to shareholders.

The theory behind the Republican tax bill was to allow corporations and the richest Americans to keep more of their already outrageous wealth, and maybe the benefits will trickle down to everyone else. As we are already seeing, that idea was a folly, and the American middle class will eventually pay the price.

Because of the enormous cost of the Republican tax bill, \$1.5 trillion, the deficit and debt will grow over the next several years and Republicans are already targeting Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare for cuts to make up the difference. So on top of a tax cut that mostly goes to the folks who need it the least, the Republican tax bill is an excuse for Republicans to come after Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

That is why the bill is so unpopular that Republicans have abandoned it in last two special elections in Virginia and Pennsylvania.

The American people are already waking up to the reality that the Republican tax bill was not the middle-class miracle the Republicans promised, and in November, they will have the chance to move America in a dramatically different direction by voting for a party that actually wants to focus tax relief on working America, not corporate America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. 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.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1865, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339, H.R. 1865, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

S.J. RES. 54—MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, fiscal years 1984 and 1985, and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, I make a motion to discharge S.J. Res. 54 from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there is 4 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

Mr. SANDERS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution states in no uncertain terms that "Congress shall have power to . . . declare war."

Let me repeat it. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution states it is Congress that has the power to declare war.

The Founding Fathers gave the power to authorize military conflicts to Congress, the branch most accountable—not to the President but to Congress—and that is the issue we are going to be debating today.

For far too long, Congress, under Democratic and Republican administrations, has abdicated its constitutional role in authorizing war. The time is long overdue for Congress to reassert that constitutional authority, and that is what today is about.

That is why I and 14 cosponsors of this resolution—Senators LEE, MURPHY, WARREN, BOOKER, DURBIN, LEAHY,

MARKEY, FEINSTEIN, WYDEN, MERKLEY, BLUMENTHAL, GILLIBRAND, SCHATZ, and BALDWIN—that is what we are doing with S.J. Res. 54.

What we are saying is, if Congress wants to go to war in Yemen or anyplace else, vote to go to war. That is your constitutional responsibility. Stop abdicating that responsibility to a President, whether it is a Republican President or, as in the past, Democratic Presidents.

I expect that colleagues today will be arguing about what the word “hostilities” means within the context of the 1973 War Powers Resolution. What does the word “hostilities” mean? Some will argue that American troops are not out there shooting and getting shot at, not exchanging gunfire with their enemies, and that we are not really engaged in the horrifically destructive Saudi-led war in Yemen. That is what some will argue on the floor today—that we are really not engaged in hostilities; we are not exchanging fire.

Well, please tell that to the people of Yemen whose homes and lives are being destroyed by weapons marked “Made in the USA” and dropped by planes being refueled by the U.S. military on targets chosen with U.S. assistance. Only in the narrowest, most legalistic terms can anyone argue that the United States is not actively involved in hostilities alongside Saudi Arabia in Yemen.

Let me take a minute to tell my colleagues what is happening in Yemen right now because a lot of people don’t know. It is not something that is on the front pages of the newspapers or covered terribly much on television.

Right now, in a very poor nation of 27 million people—that is the nation of Yemen—in November of last year, the United Nations Emergency Relief Coordinator told us that Yemen was on the brink of “the largest famine the world has seen for many decades.” That is from the United Nations. So far, in this country of 27 million people—this very poor country—over 10,000 civilians have been killed and 40,000 civilians have been wounded. Over 3 million people in Yemen, in a nation of 27 million, have been displaced—driven from their homes. Fifteen million people lack access to clean water and sanitation because water treatment plants have been destroyed. More than 20 million people in Yemen—over two-thirds of the population of that country—need some kind of humanitarian support, with nearly 10 million in acute need of assistance. More than 1 million suspected cholera cases have been reported, representing potentially the worst cholera outbreak in world history. That is what is going on in Yemen today as a result of the Saudi-led war there.

Here is the bottom line: If the President of the United States or Members of Congress believe that support for this war is in the U.S. interests—and I think some do—if you think that the

United States right now, for our own interests, should be involved in the civil war in Yemen, being led by Saudi Arabia, then Members of the U.S. Senate should have the courage to vote for U.S. participation in that war. It is nothing more complicated than that.

If you want to come to the floor of the Senate and make the case as to why you think it is good public policy for us to be involved in the civil war in Yemen, come to the floor and oppose our resolution, but what I hope very much that we will not see today is the tabling of this motion and the refusal by Members of the Senate to vote up or down as to whether we wish to continue aiding Saudi Arabia in this humanitarian disaster.

If you believe, as I do, that we should not get sucked into this civil war, which has already caused so much human suffering, please vote against tabling the motion to discharge and vote with us on final passage. If you believe the United States should continue to assist Saudi Arabia in this war, I urge you to have the courage to tell your constituents that is your decision and why you have made that decision when you vote against final passage. In other words, if you support the war, have the courage to vote for it; if you don’t, support the resolution Senator LEE, Senator MURPHY, and I have introduced.

Let me give my colleagues at least two reasons why Congress must reassert its constitutional authority over the issue of war and why we cannot continue to abdicate that responsibility to the President, and those have everything to do with the two most significant foreign policy disasters in the modern history of the United States—the war in Iraq and the war in Vietnam. In both of these cases, Congress sat back and failed to ask the hard questions as two administrations—one Republican, one Democratic—led us into conflicts with disastrous consequences.

Interestingly, today is a historically significant day for us to debate this resolution. Fifteen years ago today, on March 20, 2003, the war in Iraq began, and the bombs started falling in Baghdad—15 years ago today. I was one of those who opposed the Iraq war in the beginning, and today it is now broadly acknowledged that the war—that war—was a foreign policy blunder of enormous magnitude. That war created a cascade of instability around the region that we are still dealing with today in Syria and elsewhere and will be for many years to come. Indeed, had it not been for the war in Iraq, ISIS would almost certainly not exist.

That war deepened hostilities between Sunni and Shia communities in Iraq and elsewhere. It exacerbated a regional conflict for power between Saudi Arabia and Iran and their proxies in places like Syria, Lebanon, and Yemen, and it undermined American diplomatic efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The devastation experienced by Iraq’s civilians was enormous. A recent academic study by U.S., Canadian, and Iraqi researchers found that over 400,000 Iraqi civilians—nearly half a million people—were killed directly or indirectly as a consequence of that war.

That war led to the displacement of nearly 5 million people, both inside and outside Iraq, putting great stress on the ability of surrounding countries to deal with these refugee flows.

We have also seen this more recently in Europe as the large numbers of people fleeing the Syrian war have generated a backlash in European countries, giving rise to anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant sentiments.

The war in Iraq led to the deaths—to the deaths—of some 4,400 American troops and the wounding, physical and emotional, of tens of thousands of others, not to mention the pain inflicted on family members. By the way, that war in Iraq cost us trillions of dollars—money that could have been spent on healthcare, education, infrastructure, and environmental protection.

The Iraq war, like so many other military conflicts, had unintended consequences. It ended up making us less safe, not more safe.

It must be said that the Bush administration and the President lied when he told the American people: “[Saddam’s] regime is seeking a nuclear bomb, and with fissile material could build one within a year.” That was not true.

Vice President Dick Cheney lied when he told us:

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies, and against us.

Dick Cheney—not true.

No one disagrees that Saddam Hussein was a brutal, murderous dictator, but it is now known he had nothing to do with 9/11. The Bush administration lied to the American people. Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction. It was not connected to 9/11.

The American people were misled by the Bush administration into believing that the Iraq war was necessary to prevent another 9/11, and Congress did not challenge them on those claims in a way that Congress should have—with disastrous consequences.

That was a Republican administration. Now let me tell you about a Democratic administration where, once again, Congress refused to assert its constitutional responsibility.

Let us go back to 1964, to a conflict that began under similarly false premises. President Lyndon Johnson cited an attack on a U.S. ship in the Gulf of Tonkin as a pretext for escalating the U.S. intervention in Vietnam and sending more and more and more troops into that quagmire.

But we now know from declassified recordings that Johnson himself doubted that the USS *Maddox* had come

under fire on August 4, 1964. As we all know, that alleged attack was used to push for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution authorizing Johnson to escalate U.S. military involvement in Vietnam, and we now know that the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, misled Congress and the public in order to generate support for that resolution.

You don't have to believe me. This is what LCDR Pat Paterson wrote in a paper for the U.S. Naval Institute: "The evidence suggests a disturbing and deliberate attempt by Secretary of Defense McNamara to distort the evidence and mislead Congress."

Paterson, interestingly enough, also quotes another author who wrote:

To enhance his chances for election, [Johnson] and McNamara deceived the American people and Congress about events and the nature of the American commitment in Vietnam. They used a questionable report of a North Vietnamese attack on American naval vessels to justify the president's policy to the electorate and to defuse Republican senator and presidential candidate Barry Goldwater's charges that Lyndon Johnson was ir-resolute and "soft" in the foreign policy arena.

Interestingly enough, that author is H.R. McMaster, President Trump's current National Security Advisor.

Lyndon Johnson's administration misled both Congress and the American people into that war, just as the Bush administration misled us into the war in Iraq, and what disasters both of those wars were. The war in Vietnam nearly destroyed an entire generation of young people. Almost 60,000 died in that war, and God knows how many came back wounded in body and in spirit. It almost destroyed an entire generation. Yet Congress abdicated its responsibility in Vietnam, as it did in Iraq.

The truth about Yemen is that U.S. forces have been actively engaged in support of the Saudi coalition in this war, providing intelligence and aerial refueling of planes whose bombs have killed thousands of people and made this humanitarian crisis far worse. U.S. involvement in the Yemen war has also proved counterproductive to the effort against al-Qaida's affiliates. The State Department's "Country Reports on Terrorism 2016" found that the conflict between Saudi-led forces and the Houthi insurgents has helped al-Qaida's and ISIS's Yemen branch to "deepen their inroads across much of the country." In other words, as we see again, when there is chaos, when there is mass confusion, ISIS and their allies are able to jump in.

Furthermore, while Iran's support for Houthi insurgents is of serious concern for all of us, the truth is that this war has increased, not decreased, the opportunities for Iranian interference.

The Trump administration has tried to justify our involvement in the Yemen war as necessary to push back on Iran. Well, another administration told us that invading Iraq was necessary to confront al-Qaida, and another told us that the Vietnam war was

necessary to contain Communists. None of that turned out to be true.

The Congress, at those times, should have asked the hard questions, which they didn't ask. The Congress should have taken its constitutional role seriously and should have done what the Constitution demands that it do, and that is what my cosponsors and I are doing today.

I see my colleague Senator LEE here. He has been very active in standing up for the Constitution on this issue, and I will yield to him in a minute. But here is the bottom line—and it is not a complicated line; the Constitution is clear: The U.S. Congress decides whether we go to war. There is no question in my mind that by aiding Saudi Arabia in the way that we are doing, we are assisting in war. We are in a conflict.

If Members of the Senate think that conflict makes sense and is good public policy for the United States of America, vote down our resolution. If you agree with Senator LEE and me that it is a bad idea, support us. But what I would urge in the strongest possible terms is that Members of the Senate have to end the abdication of our constitutional responsibility. Accept it; vote yes or vote no. Do not vote to table this resolution and duck the constitutional responsibility that we have.

I yield the floor to my colleague, Senator MIKE LEE.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the issue we are confronting today is one that deals with the separation of powers outlined in the U.S. Constitution.

Our system of government was set up in such a way as to protect the people from the dangers associated with the excessive accumulation of power in the hands of a few. We knew from our experience under British rule that bad things happen, especially at a national level, when too few people exercise too much of the power. Nowhere is this more evident than in the case of the war power. In fact, much of the Revolutionary struggle that led to the creation of our Nation resulted from wartime activities undertaken by a monarch thousands of miles and an ocean away. It is important today that we remember those same concerns and the constraints placed in our Constitution as we run our government nearly 2½ centuries later.

I am happy to be here with my colleague, Senator SANDERS, to file a discharge motion for our resolution, S.J. Res. 54.

Whether you are present in the Chamber today, physically with us, or whether you are tuning in at home, I hope you will listen closely so that we can fill you in on the unauthorized Middle East war that your government—the government of the United States of America—is supporting and actively participating in as a cobelligerent.

This war in Yemen has killed tens of thousands of innocent civilians—

human beings, lest we forget—each one of them possessing innate, immeasurable worth and dignity. This war has created refugees, orphans, widows; it has cost millions of dollars; and, believe it or not, at the end of the day, it actually has, quite arguably, undermined our fight against terrorist threats such as ISIS. I will expand on these unfortunate facts in a moment, but for now, let's just focus on one thing. Our military's involvement in Yemen has not been authorized by Congress as required by the Constitution.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution states that the Congress shall have the power to declare war—Congress, not the President, not the Pentagon, not someone else within the executive branch of government, but Congress. Yet in 2015, then-President Obama initiated our military involvement in Yemen and did so without authorization from Congress.

The current administration has continued Obama's war. Senator SANDERS, Senator MURPHY, our cosponsors, and I are now giving Congress a chance to fix this error by debating and voting on our Nation's continued involvement in this unauthorized, illegal war in Yemen.

If, as our opponents claim, this war is necessary, then surely they can defend that argument before this body and before the House of Representatives and, ultimately, secure authorization from Congress, just as the Constitution demands under article I, section 8. But if, on the other hand, they cannot defend this war and they cannot persuade a majority of the Members of this body and a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives that this is a war that needs to be fought, then it needs to end. Let's have an honest reckoning about this war today.

Before this debate gets underway in earnest, there are a few points that I would like to clarify.

First, let's talk about Iran for just a moment. Yes, the Houthis did fire on a U.S. Navy vessel. This only reinforces the fact that Yemenis view the United States as a participant in this war, regardless of whether or not Congress wants to acknowledge that participation or approve it, as the Constitution requires. But overall, there are conflicting reports about the extent of Iranian support for the Houthi rebels.

What we do know is this: The Houthis are a regional rebel group that does not itself threaten the United States. While the Houthis are no friends of ours, neither are they a serious threat to American national security. The longer we fight against them, the more reason we give them to hate America and embrace the opportunists who are our true enemy in the region—Iran. And the more we prolong activities that destabilize the region, the longer we harm our own interests in terms of trade and broader regional security.

The bottom line is this: We are spending a great deal of time and treasure to defeat a regional rebel group

with no desire to attack the homeland and unclear ties to Iran. Iran's influence is much clearer in other parts of the Middle East with other groups—for example, with the murderous terrorist group, Hezbollah.

If we want to counter Iran, let's have that debate in Congress and vote to equip this administration with the necessary authorization to use our vast and fearsome military resources to defeat its proxies—not to create new proxies by turning rebel groups against us.

Let's talk about ISIS for a moment. Our resolution would not impede the military's ability to fight terror groups, like ISIS, inside Yemen. The resolution itself requires the removal of U.S. forces from hostilities in Yemen, except—except, and I quote—“United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at Al Qaeda or associated forces.” That is a direct quote from the text of the resolution itself. It should put to rest the notion that this would somehow jeopardize our ability to fight terrorists.

The Pentagon and the executive branch have long insisted that they have adequate authority under the authorization for the use of military force enacted in 2001—adequate authority under the 2001 AUMF to fight against ISIS.

If those at the Pentagon and elsewhere in the executive branch or any of my colleagues now claim that this resolution specifically needs to exempt operations against ISIS, then what are we to make of their previous confidence in the 2001 AUMF? Have they suddenly lost faith in that document overnight or are they merely using this argument as a pretense to oppose our resolution?

I personally believe that the 2001 AUMF has been stretched too far. Our resolution, however, is completely agnostic on this point. It is entirely agnostic about whether counterterror operations against al-Qaida and ISIS can proceed in the wake of the resolution. Our resolution is specific, and our resolution relates specifically to the Houthis. Nothing in this bill may be interpreted as an AUMF.

Lastly, with regard to Saudi Arabia and the ongoing visit of Crown Prince Mohammad bin Salman in Washington, DC, at the moment, I have been deeply concerned about our illegal war in Yemen since its inception and have taken steps to end our involvement in that war. I presented questions to our combatant commanders on the topic, just as I have for other unauthorized operations in the past. I had hoped the new administration might take prompt action to end our unauthorized activities in Yemen. Sadly, that has not occurred.

Last fall, after countless missed opportunities and some broken assurances, my colleagues and I decided it was time to take matters into our own hands. By “matters,” I mean those matters that are specifically already in

our hands, those matters that are already granted to the Congress and to no other branch of government.

There may be some short-term impact on the U.S.-Saudi relationship, but overall the Crown Prince should understand that this protracted and clearly nonconclusive war only hurts his government's stability and legitimacy. He, too, should want a quick end to this conflict. Saudi Arabia is an indispensable partner in the region, without which the United States would be less successful. But the Saudis themselves are at an inflection point within their own government. Working with the United States should be a goal for the Crown Prince and should be a credibility-lending endeavor.

The resolution before you is the product of years of effort. It was not timed in any way, shape, or form to coincide with the Crown Prince's visit. It was drafted with one thing in mind, which is to make sure that before we put U.S. blood and treasure on the line, before we put the sons and daughters of the American people who have served in harm's way into an area in which hostilities are ongoing, to get involved in combat capacities in an area where conflict is brewing, we owe it to them, we owe it to their parents, we owe it to their families, and we owe it to ourselves, having taken an oath to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, to do it the right way—not just because the Constitution requires that but also because of the reasons the Constitution requires that.

It makes sense that when we are doing something that has a greater capacity to impact our government, our standing in the world, our own security, and the lives of those who were sworn to protect us, we do it in the right way, not just through the appropriate branch of government but through the appropriate branch of government in part because that is the only place where an open, honest, public debate can occur.

It is one thing to make a decision somewhere within the military chain of command on whether to undertake a particular action, but this is one of the reasons why, in order to declare war, in order to get us involved in a war in the first place, it requires action by Congress, because this is the branch of the Federal Government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals.

Over the course of many decades, under the leadership of Congresses and White Houses of every conceivable partisan combination, we have seen a gradual shift of power in a number of areas—including regulatory policy, trade policy, and the exercise of the war power—over to the executive branch of government. When we don't exercise that power, it starts to atrophy; the Constitution means less, and it is less able to protect the American people. That is why this resolution matters. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let's do this the right way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague from Utah a very simple question? Whether or not he agrees with me that we are talking about two separate issues.

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

Mr. SANDERS. It seems to me we are talking about two separate issues, one of which is really a no-brainer. The no-brainer is that the Constitution is very clear that it is the Congress, not the President, that determines whether we go to war; that we are currently in an unauthorized war in Yemen; and that the first vote—if there is an attempt to table this, that would be absolutely unacceptable because we would be abdicating our decisionmaking. And then the second vote is the vote on whether we think it is a good idea to be in Yemen.

Would the Senator agree with me that at least on the motion to table, every Member of the Senate should allow us to go forward and vote against tabling so that people in the Senate accept their constitutional responsibility to vote yes or no on the war in Yemen?

Mr. LEE. I would certainly agree that the answer is yes in response to that question. It is Congress that gets to decide whether we go to war; it is not the executive branch.

For that very same reason, when we have brought up this resolution calling into question whether we have authorized that war and whether we should continue in the absence of an authorization for that war—if we are asked to table that, that very request amounts to a request for abdication of our constitutional responsibility.

A favorite song of mine called “Freewill” by the band Rush came out several decades ago, and it says: “If you choose not to decide, you still have made a choice.”

If we choose in this moment to table this resolution, we are making a choice to be willfully blind to the exercise of a power that belongs to us, to allow someone else to exercise it without proper authority. That is wrong. That cannot happen, not on our watch.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me concur with what Senator LEE just said. There may be disagreements about the wisdom of being allied with Saudi Arabia on the war in Yemen. There will be honest disagreements about that. But there cannot be and there must not be an abdication of constitutional responsibility in terms of making that decision.

If you think that U.S. participation in the war in Yemen is a good idea, you can vote against our resolution. If you agree with us that it is a bad idea, support our resolution. But simply to abdicate your responsibility on this issue would be absolutely irresponsible.

I hope we have virtually unanimous support in voting against the effort to table. Then let's get into the debate about the wisdom of the war and vote it up or down. Needless to say, I hope

the Members support our resolution. Let's at least have that vote and not abdicate our responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, some of our colleagues from time to time may ask us how we would define the term "hostilities" and what the United States might be doing that triggers that definition. I welcome that discussion. It is important to note that the U.S. Code is somewhat vague on that question, defining "hostilities" broadly to mean any conflict subject to the laws of war. I don't necessarily view that broad definition as problematic. It is something that allows Congress to assess the unique circumstances in each instance on specific grounds at each point in time.

Our involvement in war and in conflict has greatly changed over the years, and it will continue to change as the nature of international relations changes and as the technology we use in war changes and develops. It doesn't mean we are not involved in hostilities. I welcome further discussion on this matter.

Let's look at the facts of our involvement in Yemen today. Since 2015, U.S. forces have aided the Saudi coalition with midair refueling and target selection assistance, or, as Defense Secretary Jim Mattis said in December 2017, our military is helping the Saudis "make certain [they] hit the right thing." In other words, we are helping a foreign power bomb its adversaries in multiple ways. If that doesn't include aid and amount to and itself constitute hostilities, then such words have lost their meaning.

There are those within the executive branch of government who would define the term "hostilities" so narrowly that it would apply only when our armed services personnel are on the ground firing upon or being fired upon by an enemy force. It is understandable in some respects that they would want to define it that way because if they define it that way, that puts the executive in power.

That is one of the reasons we have to remember that there is a natural tension built into our constitutional structure to make sure that not all power is concentrated in any one branch of government. It is one of the reasons Alexander Hamilton pointed out in *Federalist No. 69* that war would not be exercised by the Executive in our system of government. In this instance, as in many others, the Executive in our system of government would differ from the monarch under the old system, the one that was based in London. The King had the power to take Great Britain to war. The King didn't have to seek a declaration of war from Parliament; the King could act in and of himself to decide when to take us to war. It is one of the reasons why it matters here.

When we see the definition of "hostilities" narrowed to the point that it

very often will not exist given the way we engage in hostilities today, given modern technologies that frequently allow us to engage in acts that anyone would have to acknowledge amount to combat, amount to conflict, amount to hostilities, they can still explain it away as something the Executive can do independently of Congress.

This resolution will not do anything, according to some, because we are not engaged in hostilities in Yemen. I am building upon this argument that is based upon a very narrow, cramped, distorted interpretation of the word "hostilities."

When people ask what we think the resolution would do if it were to pass—first of all, it is clear that we are engaged in hostilities because when we are involved as a cobelligerent, involved in midair refueling in combat flights, when we are identifying targets for the Saudi-led military coalition in Yemen against the Houthis, those are combat operations, and those are clearly hostilities. But even if we were to suppose that U.S. activities in Yemen somehow did not constitute hostilities according to the War Powers Resolution, the text of our resolution is crystal clear about what constitutes "hostilities" for its purpose; namely, "aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and mid-flight aerial refueling." Our resolution would end those very specific activities against the Houthis in Yemen—nothing more and nothing less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I speak only for myself on this issue and will tell you why I am so motivated about this resolution.

If we think back on the modern history of our country and if we think of the two most significant foreign policy decisions—the war in Vietnam and the war in Iraq and the unbelievable unintended consequences that those two destructive wars had—what we conclude is that in both of those wars—one under a Democratic President and one under a Republican President—the Congress abdicated its responsibility. It did not ask the right questions. In both instances, we got into those terrible wars based on lies. The Johnson administration lied as to why we should get involved in the war in Vietnam, and the Bush administration lied as to why we should get involved in the war in Iraq.

It just seems to me that if nothing else, based on those two examples of what the war in Vietnam did and what the war in Iraq did, Congress has to take a deep breath and understand that the people who wrote the Constitution were not fools when they said it must be the elected people who are closest to the constituents who have to debate these issues and who know that decisions being made will result in the loss of lives of the people in their own States, and we have abdicated that responsibility.

No one can predict whether the decisions made by Congress are going to be good decisions with regard to war and peace, whether we are going to do better than Presidents did. I don't know. At the very least, we have to accept our responsibility and not simply take the word of Presidents who in the two most recent, significant wars have lied to the American people.

Once again, I know there may be differences of opinion regarding the wisdom of involvement by the United States in the war in Yemen. If you think it is a good idea, vote against our resolution. There should be no difference of opinion about accepting our responsibility under the Constitution and voting on whether it is a good idea.

I yield to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, Senator SANDERS mentioned some previous wars and how this may or may not relate to those previous wars. One of the other questions we get from time to time is also a related question: How does this impact or influence operations somewhere else in the world where the United States is engaged? Would the passage of this resolution mean that every other type of operation anywhere else in the world would have to stop too? What about our global counterterrorism activities? We sometimes get those questions.

The main reason we drafted this resolution was to bring our activities in Yemen into line with our laws as expressed in the Constitution. So if we are fighting unauthorized wars in other places around the globe, then those wars need to be authorized by Congress, or else they would need to end. Importantly, however, this resolution does not itself make law or set precedent for other operations. This resolution applies just to this conflict in Yemen against the Houthis. Each conflict or operation ought to be evaluated on its own merits and measured against our national interest and any existing authorizations for the use of military force. We can't evaluate this resolution as being something that requires us to swallow the entire elephant at once. This is just focusing on one issue in one part of the world. We need not take any kind of a "sky is falling" approach that will say this will immediately jeopardize everything else we are doing in any and every other part of the world.

Global counterterror operations under title 10 or title 50 involve U.S. action but arise in different ways, and any other activity that we undertake or authority that we cite in introducing our armed service personnel into hostilities cannot serve as a substitute for congressional action as contemplated by the Constitution. The power to declare war belongs to Congress and not to the Executive. Just because government breaks the rules often—and sometimes with impunity—it does not mean it has the right to

break the rules, nor does it mean, certainly, that we shouldn't call out rule-breaking when we see it going on, but that is a debate for another day.

The resolution before us today is specific to our activities against the Houthis in Yemen. It does not authorize or deauthorize military force in any other part of the globe or against any other foe. In fact, the resolution specifies that it does not interfere with existing operations against al-Qaida and its affiliates. Our resolution is narrowly tailored to end our efforts to assist forces that are fighting against the Houthis. It is deliberately narrow in order to address a black-and-white situation that is clearly not covered by any existing authorization for the use of military force. Counterterror operations that are supported by the 2001 AUMF and other legitimate authorizations would not be affected by this resolution.

I yield to Senator MURPHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am grateful to join for a few moments the cosponsors of this resolution—Senator LEE and Senator SANDERS.

It is important to pick up on what Senator LEE was just putting down—the notion that this is a limited resolution that speaks to our participation in an unauthorized, illegal partnership with the Saudis to bomb the country of Yemen. It does not affect our partnership with Saudi Arabia and others in the gulf region to continue to confront terror, to continue to confront al-Qaida—a specific carve-out in this legislation that allows for 2001 AUMF authorized activities to go forward.

It is also important to note that if you care about the priority of taking on al-Qaida and taking on ISIS in the region, then you should support debating our resolution because all of the evidence suggests that the continuation of this civil war inside Yemen is making ISIS and AQAP, which is the arm of al-Qaida that has the clearest intentions of attacking the homeland, both more powerful. The AQAP controls much more territory inside Yemen than it did in the beginning of this civil war.

If you take the time to meet with Yemeni-Americans, they will tell you that inside Yemen, this bombing campaign is not perceived as a Saudi bombing campaign; it is perceived as a U.S.-Saudi bombing campaign. What we are doing is radicalizing the Yemeni people against the United States. Add to this the new information that suggests that some of our partners in the coalition, although not directly working with al-Qaida, are starting to arm some very unsavory Salafi militias inside Yemen that are filled with the types of people—the types of extremist individuals—who could take the training they have received from the coalitions and the weapons they have received from the coalitions and easily turn against the United States.

If you care about the mission against terrorism, then you should support debating our resolution.

Just to recap the reasons we are here today, we need to have a debate on the lack of authorization for military force because it is time for Congress to step up and do our constitutional duty.

The administration wrote in its letter to us that we do not have the authority as the U.S. Congress to weigh in on military activity that is waged by the administration unless there are two armies firing at each other on the ground in an area of conflict. That is the administration's definition of "hostilities," and admittedly that is a definition that has been used by Democrats and Republicans. This is not exclusive to the Trump administration. The problem with that is that it would allow for the United States, through Executive decision only, to wage an air campaign against a country that wipes it out without there being any say from the U.S. Congress.

Clearly, what is happening in Yemen today meets the definition of "hostilities." We have shown pictures on this floor before of entire cities that have been wiped out. More than 10,000 civilians have been killed in the largest outbreak of cholera in the history of the world in terms of what we have recorded. Those are hostilities, and the United States is clearly engaging in those hostilities because we are helping with targeting and refueling the planes that are supplying the munitions. If we cede to unlimited Executive authority with respect to this engagement, there will be no end to that.

Lastly, let me speak to what is happening on the ground. There is zero evidence that U.S. participation in this coalition has made things better. Civilian casualties are not getting better. The day after Christmas, over 60 civilians were killed in a series of airstrikes. Reports are that last month, the Saudis engaged once again in something called double tapping, by which they targeted an area in which civilians lived, waited for the emergency responders to arrive, and then hit again—something that is not allowed by international humanitarian law. The humanitarian catastrophe itself is getting worse, not better.

Maybe most important is that the battle lines inside Yemen are not changing. The Saudis have been telling us for years: Stick with us. If you keep on helping us bomb the Yemeni people, we will win this war. We will get back control of Hudayda and of Sana'a.

That is not happening. At the beginning of this war, the Houthis controlled about 70 percent of the population inside Yemen. Today, the Houthis control about 70 percent of the population inside Yemen. If we continue to support this bombing campaign, nothing will change except that more people will die, except that more civilians will be hit by the bombs we help to drop, except that al-Qaida will continue to control big portions of that country.

While Senator LEE notes that this resolution is actually not on the merits of our engagement there and that it is whether we have the legal justification to be there, let's admit that if you do consider the merits, other than backing the play of our historic ally, there is nothing to suggest that our participation there is making things better rather than worse.

I yield to Senator SANDERS.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me ask my friend from Connecticut the same question I asked Senator LEE, and that is whether he agrees with me that we are really dealing with two separate issues here.

The first issue is really, in a sense, a no-brainer. It is whether the Congress or, in this case, the Senate of the United States accepts its constitutional responsibility on issues of war. We are now engaged in a war in Yemen with Saudi Arabia. The Constitution is very clear in article I, section 8 that it is the Congress that determines whether this country goes to war.

I believe what will happen in a few hours is that a motion to table will come up. Would you agree with me that it would be an act of cowardice, in a sense, an irresponsibility, an abdication of congressional responsibility, for somebody to vote to table that resolution?

Mr. MURPHY. By voting to table the consideration of this resolution, you are voting to stop a debate, a conversation, from happening in the Senate about whether proper authorization exists.

Let's be honest about what this first vote is. This first vote is, do we want to talk about whether there is authorization to perpetuate this war? By voting to stop debate, by voting to table this motion and refrain from proceeding to a conversation about this topic, we are, in a very clear way, signaling to the administration and to the American public that we are not interested in exercising our article I authority on the issue of war-making.

Mr. SANDERS. In other words, no matter what one's view may be about the wisdom of the war, to vote to table is to abdicate our constitutional responsibility?

Mr. MURPHY. It sends a very clear signal to the administration that we are not interested in even having a debate here about complicated questions of legal authority for serious military engagements overseas.

Mr. SANDERS. All right. Let me just concur with Senator MURPHY.

If you think it is a good idea for the United States to be involved in the war in Yemen with Saudi Arabia, you can vote against our resolution. Yet I can think of no reason at all as to why any Member of Congress would vote to table this resolution and prevent that discussion, and I would hope that we would have strong support against any motion to table and allow that debate to go forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

STOP ENABLING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this week we are discussing, among other topics, the sad fact of sex trafficking online. The reason is because yesterday we voted to advance a piece of legislation called SESTA, or the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act. The purpose of this legislation is crystal clear. We want to put an end to this abominable practice, and we want to stop shielding or protecting those web platforms that promote it.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. Over the past year, like many of my colleagues, I met with law enforcement and victims' rights groups across the country who talk about this as a continuing problem. I met with technology providers who want to end the practice but want to make sure they maintain their independence from Federal regulation writ large. I have been in regular contact with my colleagues over at the House to make sure this bill is considered and passed in a timely fashion. I think it is fair to characterize the negotiations as delicate.

A small group of Senators, including our colleague JOHN MCCAIN, the senior Senator from Arizona, wanted to make sure that everyone understood what this bill does and what it does not do. What it does do is to protect our children. It provides justice to victims, and it makes sure that Federal laws don't protect those who profit from sex trafficking online. What it does not do is somehow to stymie free speech. It does not restrict web platforms from publishing objectionable content.

For example, under the Communications Decency Act, now websites have to screen for child pornography. That is one of the explicit exceptions to the Communications Decency Act, which basically provides immunity to these web platforms from liability. What we are doing is adding to that human trafficking, and it is appropriate that we do so.

This does not discourage websites that are already taking steps to proactively remove improper conduct and police their own networks. I would say to those who do: Keep up the good work.

Today the internet and other forms of technology have made certain forms of predatory behavior easier to engage in. This bill addresses this development head-on. It would allow sex trafficking victims to have their day in court by eliminating Federal liability protections for technology providers who knowingly facilitate online sex trafficking. It would allow State and local law enforcement to investigate and prosecute providers that violate Federal sex trafficking laws.

This bill was introduced last summer after a 2-year inquiry by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which produced a report. That report found that not only had sex trafficking run rampant in certain online spaces but also that some websites had tried to cover it up.

Well, no longer. Last fall, the Senate Commerce Committee unanimously approved SESTA, the bill on the floor that the House passed last month. Now it is our turn.

Senator PORTMAN, the junior Senator from Ohio, has been this bill's greatest champion since its inception. I believe he was one of the members of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which produced the report I mentioned. He has been involved in this issue for a long time. He has been informing us time and again of the ways in which sex trafficking has morphed from the street corner to the smartphone.

In the committee's investigation, one website in particular came up time and again, and the name is no stranger to the Senate or the Congress. It is backpage, a notorious publication now online that is responsible for three-quarters of all child trafficking reports.

It eventually became clear that even though that site was actually helping to sell young women for sex, and even the victims and their families were suing backpage, none of the lawsuits were successful because of what some people are coming to believe is an outdated immunity protection for technology providers under the Communications Decency Act, which I mentioned a moment ago.

The original law was intended to protect free speech online, which is important. I am a firm believer in the First Amendment, as I know we all are, but free speech is no license to engage in criminal activity.

At last count, 67 Senators have joined our effort as cosponsors. We are joined in support of SESTA by anti-human-trafficking advocates, law enforcement, State attorneys general, the civil rights community, faith-based groups, and tech companies like Facebook and Oracle.

Our colleague from Oregon has introduced two amendments, which I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose. The first would appropriate new money for the Attorney General to investigate and prosecute website operators that criminally facilitate sex trafficking. The problem is that this would violate the blue slip rule and subject the bill to a point of order. In other words, there are constitutional issues raised about where that sort of legislation would originate. It has to originate in the House. It would almost certainly guarantee the demise of this legislation. In other words, it is a poison pill. It is not that we will not support funding to prosecute traffickers. In fact, we will provide ample funding through the Department of Justice later this week. It is that those funds should be appropriated through the usual process and then handed over to State and local officials who can use them effectively.

The second amendment that will be offered is the "Bad Samaritan" amendment. This would prevent websites from being held accountable for any ef-

forts to moderate content, even when those efforts are taken in bad faith or obviously intended to miss their mark and instead protect sex traffickers. In some States courts have found that websites like backpage might be held liable when they selectively edit sex trafficking ads to make them more difficult to be identified by law enforcement.

The "Bad Samaritan" amendment could protect platforms like backpage.com from liability for bad-faith editing practices, leaving victims with even less of a recourse than they have today. Simply put, it could eviscerate the steps we are taking in SESTA. I am confident that our colleague does not intend this result, but that would be the consequence of adopting either one of those amendments.

So I hope my colleagues will join me in voting in favor of SESTA this week and opposing these two amendments. That is the best way we can ensure that these websites and online platforms can be held accountable for facilitating sex trafficking.

Mr. President, later today the Senate will be voting on a privileged resolution that I spoke on yesterday, offered by three of our colleagues. Simply put, it would direct the President to cut off all U.S. support for the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen.

Now, some people may be looking at a world map to figure out where Yemen is and what the import of this conflict may be, but suffice it to say that this is another proxy war being conducted against the United States and its allies by Iran, now in Yemen, just to the south of Saudi Arabia, our ally.

So as to the motion to table, I was interested to hear my friends from Connecticut and Vermont suggesting that the motion to table would stop debate. Well, that is not exactly true. What it will do is to facilitate full debate and full consideration of the merits of the underlying resolution, starting with the Foreign Relations Committee. It is very unusual for resolutions like this to come immediately to the floor, where 100 Senators vote on it, because, frankly, not all of us are as up to speed on the details of this or what the unintended impact might be as the Foreign Relations Committee that is set up for the purpose of examining legislation with regard to our international relationships in matters like this.

This is an important and timely matter, as high-level Saudi officials are in Washington this week. The Crown Prince is scheduled to meet with President Trump today. I met with him this morning, along with other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Saudi Arabia is an important partner in our counterterrorism operations and as a counterpoint to Iran. In Yemen, we see both terrorist operations—that is, ISIS and al-Qaida—and Iran actively deploying missiles and using Yemen as

a launching pad to shoot missiles into Saudi Arabia.

I mentioned that this support for our Saudi coalition is narrowly circumscribed. It takes the form of intelligence sharing, military advice, and logistical support, including air-to-air refueling. This is part of a plan that started under the Obama administration and now has continued under the Trump administration not to put American troops on the ground—boots on the ground, as we frequently refer to it—but rather to facilitate for our allies by working by, with, and through those allies to address the threat not only to them but ultimately to the United States and to peace in the region.

The role we play in Yemen is clearly a noncombat support role, and it is meant to minimize civilian casualties by improving the processes and procedures and increasing compliance with the international law of armed conflict. In other words, we are trying to help them target the terrorists and the Iranian-backed rebels and not innocent civilians, something they are not able to do as well without our assistance.

Contrary to the resolution's sponsors' claims, the United States is not engaged in hostilities in Yemen, as it has been traditionally understood, since it is not in direct conflict with the Houthi rebels. We are not fighting the Houthi rebels. U.S. soldiers are not fighting the Houthi rebels directly. We are providing support.

Proponents of this legislation rightly point out that there is a humanitarian crisis in Yemen. Unfortunately, what they sometimes leave out is that the humanitarian crisis only started when the Iranian-backed rebels overthrew the existing government. Our military assistance is helping the Saudis with their targeting to help prevent civilian casualties, to restore law and order, and to create conditions necessary to provide aid.

Let's remember, too, that it was President Obama who first implemented the refueling and logistical support policy. This is not a political matter. There is no real difference in the way that the Obama administration and the Trump administration provide this support by, with, and through our allies the Saudis and the Emiratis.

It is clear why this has been the policy of the last two administrations. Yemen is a place of great geopolitical concern. When I visited Bahrain recently with our colleagues—the U.S. Fifth Fleet is housed in Bahrain—we heard concerns about a chokepoint near an area called the Bab el Mandeb. I probably butchered that pronunciation, but we have all heard more frequently about the Straits of Hormuz, through which a lot of the world's commerce and oil flow.

Bab el Mandeb is off to the west of Yemen, only 18 miles at its narrowest point, connecting the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean. That is one of the rea-

sons why it is so important geopolitically—because 3.8 million barrels of oil pass through it each day, many of them in route to the Suez Canal and beyond. Bab el Mandeb shows the geopolitical importance of Yemen in the surrounding region. When rebels attempt to shut down shipping in this passage, the impact is global, including on the United States, and our Nation has every right to be concerned.

I fear the resolution I mention deals with our shared concerns in the wrong way. We all want to avoid civilian casualties. Most everyone is aware that Yemen has been suffering from a severe humanitarian crisis for years, including a terrible cholera outbreak. But if we were to remove U.S. involvement and logistical support for the Saudi coalition, the humanitarian crisis would likely get even worse.

The Department of Defense has critiqued the resolution on which we will be voting on the grounds that it would undermine our ability to foster long-term relationships with allies in the Gulf region. We also benefit from increased interoperability, burden-sharing, and strong security architectures throughout the world. In other words, the alliances we have in the Middle East fight the common enemy of ISIS and al-Qaida and try to contain Iran, which has been at war with the United States since 1979 in the Iranian Revolution in one form or another. All of these are on the table and all of these should be matters of our concern, but they are best considered, at least initially, in the context of the Foreign Relations Committee. They can then make a recommendation to us, and we can have the sort of fulsome debate that people have come to expect in the Senate, I hope, on matters of global importance. So all of the reasons I have mentioned here suggest that the need for our auxiliary and limited role in Yemen remains important.

Secretary Mattis, the Secretary of Defense, has said that a withdrawal of our noncombatant support could embolden Iranian-backed rebels in the area, enable further missile strikes on Saudi Arabia, our ally, and threaten the shipping lanes in the Red Sea, like the one at Bab el Mandeb. All this combined could stoke the embers of an even greater regional conflict in the Middle East.

So I hope our colleagues will vote for a tabling of this resolution, which does not cut off debate but just moves that debate, at least initially, to the Foreign Relations Committee, where, under the able leadership of Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member MENENDEZ, I have every confidence that they will explore every nook and cranny of this issue and come out with a reasoned and reasonable recommendation to the Senate and the Congress on how the U.S. Government should conduct itself.

I believe in a strong congressional role when it comes to wars and military conflict. This has been a fight,

though, that has been going on for a long time between the executive branch and the legislative branch. We have the ultimate tool. We can cut off money, but that is a rather blunt instrument. I think this administration, like previous administrations, needs to recognize that the Congress is a partner in making these decisions, not an adversary. It is important that we each play our respective role, and I am confident that we will play that role responsibly, which is really what this is all about.

If the Senate takes this vote and passes this resolution, we lose the chance for that kind of careful, deliberate, informed consideration that starts in our standing committees. We lose the chance to have the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issue a thoroughly researched recommendation.

So I hope our colleagues will vote to table the resolution and not to close off debate but to insist that this debate take place, at least initially, where it belongs, in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and that this debate then continue among all 100 Members of the Senate. We will be better informed, we will be better prepared, and we will be better able to prevent unintended consequences from taking a rash action like voting for the resolution today.

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. MENENDEZ. 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. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senators LEE, SANDERS, and MURPHY, as well as the other cosponsors of the resolution we are debating, for their commitment to elevating this debate in the Senate. I agree with my colleagues that this is an important debate with significant implications. As the elected representatives of the American people, we must serve as an effective check on the executive branch, fulfill our commitments to protect the national security interests of the United States, and be responsive to our constituents.

This debate is about how we best leverage the tools in our national security toolbox, including military tools, to protect U.S. national security. Although the resolution focuses on one particular element of U.S. policy, limited military support—basically, refueling, intelligence, and advice—to the Saudi coalition, I encourage my colleagues to expand the aperture of this debate so we may call on the administration to assert real leadership, diplomatic heft, and nonmilitary resources to move the conflict in Yemen toward a political tract.

As the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I remind

my colleagues that it is this committee that has the jurisdiction over the questions of use of force. I remind my colleagues that it was also under my leadership as chair of this committee that it twice voted on authorizations for the use of military force—once in 2013, in response to the Assad regime's use of chemical weapons against the Syrian people, and once in 2014, in response to the rapid rise and spread of the Islamic State. I remind my colleagues of these two committee votes to underscore my commitment to open debate, my willingness to take tough votes, and my enduring commitment to a robust role for the legislative branch of the U.S. Government in the use of force and oversight of that force.

Now, I am pleased that Chairman CORKER has agreed to hold a public hearing with administration witnesses on the war in Yemen—I think a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is critically important—to look at the U.S. military support to the Saudi coalition and our overarching U.S. policy for resolving the war in Yemen. I appreciate that the chairman has also made a commitment to a markup in the committee in the near future on legislation that deals with the question of Yemen, and I also welcome his commitment to markup an AUMF, or an authorization for the use of military force, in the committee. Those are significant and actually will go a long way toward an informed process about how we deal with this challenge.

In considering S.J. Res. 54, I encourage my colleagues to assess the best way to promote core U.S. security interests in the Middle East, including pushing back on Iran's aggressive and destabilizing actions across the region, countering terrorism, and ensuring the freedom of navigation. To achieve these goals, our longstanding policy has been to partner with the members of the Gulf Cooperation Council to promote the security and stability of the Arabian Peninsula.

As we consider this resolution, we must fully grasp the situation on the ground and the scope of attacks on one of our traditional security partners. Saudi Arabia has endured Yemeni-originated attacks inside its territory on a scale that no American would accept—ballistic and Scud missile attacks aimed at major Saudi population centers, cross-border attacks by Iran-backed Houthis. Those are significant.

Now, having said that, I share the concerns, I think, of a majority of my Senate colleagues regarding the conduct of the Saudi-led coalition operations, the unacceptable scale of civilian casualties, the severity of the humanitarian crisis, and the seeming lack of momentum on all sides toward a political tract to negotiate an end to this conflict.

The Saudi coalition bears significant responsibility for the magnitude of human suffering and the scale of destruction in Yemen. Seventy-five per-

cent of the population is in need of humanitarian assistance, and more than 8 million are on the brink of famine. The conditions have also led to the worst outbreak of cholera in modern history, with an estimated 1 million people suspected to be infected.

While the Houthis bear much responsibility for the violence, the Saudi-led campaign has played a significant role in exacerbating, however, the current humanitarian catastrophe. We must remember that the Houthis overthrew the internationally recognized and lawful government of Yemen and continue the conflict by resisting a political solution. So we ask the Saudis to have a political solution, but we need the Houthis to engage in a political solution as well. We also have to remember that the Houthi insurgency has vastly expanded the opportunities for al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula.

At the same time, I worry that withdrawal of limited U.S. military support to the Saudi coalition will weaken our leadership and our ability to influence a political settlement, improve humanitarian conditions, and could even make the situation worse.

Let us be clear-eyed about who will most benefit from an absence of American power. As it has done in political vacuums throughout the region, Iran will continue to expand its proxy power, and through its Revolutionary Guard, Iran will continue shipping weapons to the Houthis in violation of the arms embargo. With an emboldened Iran as patron, the Houthis will continue their campaign within Yemen and their attacks on Saudi Arabia.

Meanwhile, other nations in the region will be left questioning the commitment of its long-term security partner, the United States. In Saudi Arabia's darkest hours, as ballistic missiles are launched at major population centers in Saudi Arabia and Lebanese Hezbollah is on their border training Houthi fighters while Iran continues to transfer lethal equipment, we risk sending a signal to our partners and to our adversaries that the United States is not reliable.

Across the world, from Canada to the United Kingdom, President Trump has damaged our credibility as a reliable partner, even to some of our most stalwart allies. We must push against those concerns and show our allies that the United States upholds its international commitments. Consideration of withdrawal of support for the Saudi coalition must be taken in concert with other ways in which the United States is working to end this war—the totality of U.S. policy—which I fear is lacking.

The solution, I believe, is to bolster our diplomatic, humanitarian, and political presence to help solve this crisis, to end the human suffering, and to assert practical, concerted leadership. Thus far, the administration's approach has effectively abdicated leadership on the global stage. Thus far, while we have heard senior officials as-

sure us that there is no military solution to this conflict and a political settlement is necessary, this administration is actively dismantling the State Department and antagonizing the United Nations—the two entities that have the potential to play the most critical roles in moving toward a political settlement and addressing the humanitarian crisis.

We have vacancies at the Assistant Secretary of State level for the Middle East and the Ambassador in Riyadh—a failure of leadership.

With this dangerous approach to our diplomatic institutions, we will not be in a position to promote political solutions, and our military, once again, will be called on to do the critical work of diplomacy and development, distracting their attention from other pressing challenges—a failure of leadership.

Regarding a broader diplomatic strategy, the administration has also failed to develop a comprehensive strategy to confront Iran, including holding Iran accountable for continuing to provide missile supplies and lethal training to the Houthis.

Across land and sea, we know Lebanese Hezbollah operatives are in Yemen. Yet we have seen no sanctions and no action at the Security Council for this illicit, illegal activity. The administration has not made one designation for Iranian violations of arms embargoes, as directed by the legislation passed here 98 to 2, the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act—again, a failure of leadership.

I expect the administration to articulate and implement a comprehensive strategy for addressing Yemen that includes requisite conditions for continuing to support the Saudi coalition, a strategic push for a political settlement, efforts to alleviate the human suffering, and a comprehensive strategy to decisively push back on Iran's destabilizing actions in Yemen. This includes tough diplomacy with countries that will continue to facilitate or, at a minimum, fail to push back on Iran's actions.

I will continue pushing the administration to assert critical American diplomatic leadership rooted in the values of democracy, human rights, and human dignity.

Based upon Chairman CORKER's commitments to those hearings and future markups and based upon the totality of the situation, I will vote to table the motion to discharge from the committee because I am not ready to either abandon our partners that face an existential threat from Iran run amok in Yemen, but my support is not unconditional, and I will demand responsive actions.

I want to see, as I told the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia earlier today, a renewed commitment and a rapid movement toward a political track by the Saudi coalition. I want to see consistent demonstrations of commitment

to humanitarian access and alleviating the humanitarian crisis. I want to see followthrough in pledges of assistance to stabilize and rebuild Yemen by members of the Saudi coalition. I want to see energy and diplomacy from the Trump administration.

This week's visit of Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman is an opportunity to press forward on a path for ending the war and addressing the civilian suffering. That certainly was my message to him. The limited support the United States provides is leverage. Now the Trump administration needs to use it.

In conclusion, I invite my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to join me in holding the administration to account and pushing the administration to use our leverage to drive this conflict toward a political track. I also invite my colleagues to join me in conducting oversight of our policies and programs to counter Iran's activities in the region, including implementing CAATSA.

Finally, I want to be very clear that my vote today is not a blank check for U.S. military support, nor an endorsement of the current policy and strategy, and, finally, not a thumbs-up for the Saudi coalition that we should continue business as usual. I expect to see improvements on all fronts, as I have previously stated, and I will review future decisions with respect to potential arms sales and other votes with that type of extreme scrutiny.

There is no more time to waste. We must move toward a political settlement to end the war in Yemen, and the people of Yemen must see improvements in their situation immediately.

I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to ensure we are working toward a policy that embraces American leadership in promoting a political solution and alleviating the devastating humanitarian suffering in Yemen. I look forward to this continuing debate before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New Jersey, my good friend, the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, for his comments.

Today we met with the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia, a very impressive young man who is transforming the country. We talked about the importance of our relationship, no doubt, but we strongly, strongly pushed back on what is happening right now in Yemen and asked them to take strong corrective action. I was there when this occurred, and I certainly expressed the same.

We also talked about the enrichment they are pursuing and some of the concerns that exist there. I want to thank the ranking member for his leadership and the words he just spoke.

Let me just speak to the debate we are having on the floor. This is a very

entrepreneurial move. I don't say that to be pejorative. I know one of the Members is on the Judiciary Committee that is bringing this to the floor. I can imagine some highly important judicial issue not being debated in the Judiciary Committee but just being wafted to the floor for a debate. I know that is not the way the Judiciary Committee operates.

One of the other Members is on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I can imagine some complex cap-and-trade bill being offered, and instead of it being worked through the committee—or some ethanol bill or some other type of bill—instead of it being worked through the committee, somebody just decides to bring it directly to the floor. That is what is happening here today.

I certainly don't shy away from this debate. I appreciate the fact that MITCH MCCONNELL understood that very few Members of our body—unless they are on the Foreign Relations Committee, Armed Services Committee, or happen to take a particular interest—even know much about what is happening in Yemen, and a lot is happening there. So I appreciated the briefing that took place last week to give Members a sense as to what is occurring there, but the proper way to deal with these issues is to deal with them in committee.

One would think that maybe there is some Yemen legislation that the committee is holding and not acting on. That is not the case. Any of these Members could have offered Yemen legislation relative to this issue, and the committee would take it up. That has not occurred.

So let me tell my colleagues what is happening in the committee. We have a bill that is being worked on by Senator YOUNG and Senator SHAHEEN dealing with this very issue. They are building support. They are working with the administration to make sure the definitions are correct, and they have had numbers of people involved with them. We plan to have a Yemen hearing in the next few weeks to deal with this issue but also to take up appropriate legislation. That is the way we typically deal with issues of such importance.

Let me say this: This is an issue of great importance. It not only affects the tremendous humanitarian crisis that is occurring in Yemen and the radicalization of the Houthis, supported by Iran—a proxy of Iran—but also Saudi Arabia's own security. It also affects the way we deal with other countries. I think many people here understand fully that right now, or recently, we have been involved in the same kinds of activities with France, as they have dealt with issues in Mali, including refueling and helping them some with intelligence issues.

So this is something, again, that we need to take up in a serious way, and the committee is committed to doing so.

What I hope will happen today is that Members of this body will let the Foreign Relations Committee do its job and that we will bring a bill forward that we can properly debate and amend.

I am hoping that later today, when I offer a tabling motion, Members of this body will respect the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who deal with this issue and let it go back to committee, with the commitment that we plan to bring forth legislation to actually deal appropriately with many of the issues relative to Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and ourselves.

Let me mention one other thing. We have been working for some time to deal with the authorization for the use of military force. It has been an issue that has been before us for many years. It is the replacement and revision of the 2001–2002 AUMF that many people in this body have had concerns about because it has been so long since they were enacted. We have activities that are taking place around the world still based on those two authorizations. We have a markup on an AUMF on April 19 scheduled to try to revise so we can give people an opportunity to weigh in on this issue on the floor.

By the way, the way the AUMF is being constructed at present, when we go into new countries, when we take on new groups, the Senate would have the ability to weigh in on those issues.

So I just would like to say to the body and those who are looking in, we are not shying away from this debate. There has been no legislation whatsoever that has been held up on this topic. Legislation is being introduced soon in a bipartisan way to deal with this terrible issue that is taking place in Yemen.

We are going to have a hearing. We will have a markup. In addition to that, we are going to have a markup on a new AUMF to deal with the issues our country is dealing with around the world with al-Qaida, ISIS, and other entities that have been associated parties.

With that, I just want to let people know that is kind of the way we deal with things around here. None of us is happy with the current status, but I think a better way for us to come up with a prudent solution to what is happening there is to go through the normal committee process. I hope the other Members of the body will respect that.

I am glad that, by the way, the ranking member—by the way, this policy has been taking place in Yemen. It started under the Obama administration, the same exact policy. The Senate has acted on it by voting for appropriations, so it is not as if we have not taken action ourselves. We have done that through the NDAA. We have done that through various State Department authorizations. So we have acted upon it. There are concerns about what is happening there. Legislation is going to be introduced to try to deal with

this, and that is the way we deal with complicated issues. No one is shying away from the debate. We just hope to table this and move it back and deal with it in the orderly, appropriate way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, this afternoon there is going to be a vote on the Senate floor which is of historic importance. It is rare that I use those words to describe what is going on in the Senate Chamber. It is equally rare for us to actually take up an issue and debate it in this Chamber, but this afternoon we will face a critical vote.

I can recall, as can most Members, many votes we have cast in the course of service in Congress, both in the House and the Senate, but the votes that cause loss of sleep and worry, time and again, are votes involving war. You see, part of my responsibility in the Senate, shared by my colleagues, under article I, section 8, is to actually vote to decide whether the United States of America shall go to war.

The Founding Fathers were explicit. They wanted to give to Congress that responsibility so Members of Congress could represent their constituents—House districts and States—whom we all represent. That created an opportunity—in effect, an obligation—for us to really measure this grievous, important, historic decision against the feelings of the families who would be asked to support a war with their tax dollars or with the lives of people they love.

I can recall, back in 2001, what occurred on 9/11. Those of us alive on that date will never forget it, but I also recall that a year later we faced a decision right here in the Senate Chamber about whether, as a result of 9/11, we would go to war against Iraq and Afghanistan.

There was a long debate about whether we should invade Iraq. If you will remember, the leaders of the government told us there were weapons of mass destruction which threatened the region and the world, including the United States, and if we didn't move into Iraq and take out Saddam Hussein in his capacity, we would leave the United States in danger.

The debate went on for a long period of time, and the final vote was cast in the early morning hours in October of 2002. I remember it well and, for reasons I can't explain, I stayed on the floor after the vote. There were only two or three Members of the Senate still here. It was one of those moments where we had voted to go to war and weren't certain about what the next step would be. There were 23 of us—1 Republican and 22 Democrats—who

voted against the invasion of Iraq. I think it was one of the most important votes I ever cast.

The representations about weapons of mass destruction turned out to be false. We had no intelligence to back up that assertion. Yet that was the reason we were off to war. Well, here we are, some 16 years later, still engaged in a war in Iraq. I don't believe there is a single Member of the Senate who that night cast a vote for the invasion of that country who believed that 16 years later we would still be engaged in a war in Iraq.

Subsequently, there was a vote on the invasion of Afghanistan. It was a different circumstance. We believed Afghanistan had literally been the sourcing point for the terrorists who struck us on 9/11 and killed 3,000 innocent Americans. The argument made by the administration was, no one can do that to the United States of America without paying a price. I joined the overwhelming bipartisan majority supporting the invasion of Afghanistan to go after Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida.

I voted against invading Iraq. I voted for the invasion of Afghanistan. I can tell you, I would never ever have been able to stand here and say, with any certainty, that 16 years later, we would still be engaged in a war in Afghanistan, but we are.

The obvious question to ask is, In 16 years of war in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places in the world, how many other times has the United States and the House of Representatives come together to debate the wisdom of a decision about continuing a war or declaring a war? The answer is none—not once.

For 16 years, we have been observers and bystanders, through Presidents of both political parties, and the Congress has stood by and observed military action being taken all over the world.

Brown University did a survey called the Costs of War Project and recently published data saying that the United States fought terror in 76 countries, between October 2015 and October 2017, using its own troops and bases, through training of host country counterterrorism forces or through drone and air strikes.

In 76 different countries, we are engaged in military operations. How often has the Senate or the House come together to debate the wisdom or to even question whether those military actions were authorized? I think none. Perhaps someone could point to one, but I can't think of one time we have done it.

This afternoon is going to be different because we are being asked, as Members of the Senate, whether we are going to exercise our constitutional authority and responsibility when it comes to an ongoing war in a country most Americans couldn't find on a map—the country of Yemen.

Yemen now is embroiled in a civil war and an invasion by Saudi Arabia, and we are part of that military oper-

ation. There has been no vote in the U.S. Senate on those military activities. There is a loose connection to al-Qaida, which was referenced in the invasion of Afghanistan, as a rationalization for going after this terrorist operation now being found in Yemen, but there is more to that war in Yemen than just the presence of al-Qaida. There is an ongoing surrogate battle between Saudi Arabia and Iran, and the United States is engaged. I believe we are engaged because of our friendship with Saudi Arabia; some have argued because we sold them the planes we are now refueling.

At the very least, we ought to bring this case to the American people. That is our constitutional responsibility, and that is why this vote is important: Because we took an oath—each of us—when we became Senators, to uphold the Constitution of the United States against enemies foreign and domestic. That Constitution says the people of the United States—the ones I represent in Illinois, the ones who are represented in Oregon or in Texas—are going to have a voice in this decision through us, through our debate, through our decision.

I thank the Senators who have brought this matter to the floor today: Mr. LEE, a Republican Senator from the State of Utah; Mr. SANDERS, a Democratic Senator from Vermont; and Mr. MURPHY, another Democratic Senator, from Connecticut. I have joined in cosponsoring this effort. It really is going to put us to a test to justify what we are doing in Yemen today.

What is happening in Yemen has been characterized by the United Nations as the worst humanitarian crisis in the world—and that is saying something. Some 8 million people are dying of famine in Yemen because of this war. Some 16 million are in desperate need of humanitarian assistance immediately.

This is no skirmish. This is not just an exchange of fire. This is carnage and destruction the likes of which the world has never seen, and we are part of it. If we are part of it and should be part of it, then we should make that decision as a Senate and a House of Representatives, as the Constitution requires, but going to the bleachers, standing by the sidelines, and watching more and more military operations take place around the world without asserting our constitutional responsibility is a mistake. That is why I have cosponsored this measure this afternoon and look forward to voting for it to move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, America is very involved in a war in Yemen, and it is time we have a debate as envisioned under our Constitution.

Our Constitution did not lay out the power of deciding when to go to war with the executive branch. It places it

very clearly here, with article I, Congress is to act, but we have participated very directly, in partnership with Saudi Arabia, in the assault on Yemen, on the Houthis, and the result is a dramatic, dramatic humanitarian crisis. So we should absolutely hold that debate on this floor, as envisioned in our Constitution.

Article I, section 8 states, unequivocally, that “the Congress shall have Power . . . to declare War.” It is only Congress that is given this power under our Constitution.

If anyone has any doubts, then let’s pay attention to the other words of our Founders, James Madison himself: “In no part of the constitution is more wisdom to be found, than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department.”

The Founding Fathers’ vision was reinforced by the War Powers Resolution of 1973, also often referred to as the War Powers Act. That act was necessary because the executive branch tends to put our forces into conflict without the permission of Congress, in violation of the Constitution. So it is important to lay out the parameters under which they are allowed to do so under emergency action and the circumstances under which they are not allowed to do so.

The War Powers Act says: “It is the purpose of this joint resolution to fulfill the intent of the framers of the Constitution of the United States and insure that the collective judgement of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities.”

It goes on to say that “the constitutional powers of the President as Commander-in-Chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities . . . is clearly indicated by the circumstances, are exercised only pursuant to (1) a declaration of war, (2) specific statutory authorization, or (3) a national emergency created by attack upon the United States.”

In the case of the Saudi war we are participating in against the Houthis, it is not triggered by an attack upon the United States, nor is there any specific statutory authorization—that is why we are going to have this debate today—nor is there a declaration of war.

So the standards of the War Powers Resolution have not been met, and I call upon my colleagues to shoulder your constitutional responsibility to have this debate and hold the Executive accountable when they are violating the law of the United States of America.

There are two components to our presence in Yemen which should not be confused. One is where we are directly involved against forces associated with al-Qaida. This debate is not about that. The administration contends and we do not dispute today whether that is covered by the 2001 authorization for use of military force.

I think many of us feel that initial 2001 AUMF, authorization for use of military force, has been stretched beyond recognition. That is a debate for a different day. This argument is directly about our support of Saudi Arabia in bombing the Houthis in Yemen. That is the central question.

For us to understand why this is so important is, one, the integrity of the Constitution. If we do not hold the Executive accountable to the Constitution of the United States of America, then we are essentially taking that key, critical clause that gave us responsibility for when military force is used by the United States out of the Constitution and delivering it to the Executive. That certainly is not the vision. If people want to have that vision, they will introduce a constitutional amendment to that point. Introduce a resolution to declare war to make this action in concert with the Constitution. Create specific statutory authority in concert with the Constitution. But do not fail your constitutional responsibility to hold this debate.

The War Powers Resolution lays out clearly that our participation in the support of foreign forces engaged in hostilities is engagement under the vision of our Constitution and certainly under the law of the War Powers Resolution. It says under section 8:

Authority to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances shall not be inferred—(1) from any provision of law . . . including any provision contained in any appropriation Act, unless such provision specifically authorizes the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities.

Again, specific authorization is required.

It goes on. In this section titled “Interpretation of Joint Resolution,” it states:

“[I]ntroduction of United States Armed Forces” includes the assignment of member of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country . . . in hostilities.

Clearly, the law states that our engagement, our coordination with a foreign power engaged in war, is covered by this act. Our participation in the movement of their military forces into hostilities is covered by this act.

Therefore, we have to understand the details of our engagement.

First, the United States refueling the Saudi planes as they go to bomb the Houthis is very directly participation in the movement of military forces into engaged hostilities. We are refueling the planes en route. How can that not be participation in the movement? Certainly a plane is a part of a military force. Certainly refueling it is participation in the movement of that plane. Could this be any clearer? This is black and white. Not many things are. In terms of the violation of the War Powers Resolution and the offense against

our Constitution, this is black and white.

Second, we provide intelligence.

Third, we provide the weapons.

Fourth, we provide targeting assistance.

Fifth, we established a joint combined planning cell operation center to conduct military and intelligence activities in partnership with Saudi Arabia.

All of that fits into this direct section of the War Powers Act regarding coordination or participation in the movement of a foreign force engaged in hostilities. If this were a minor involvement—it is not. We have participated thousands of times in this manner. On a daily basis, we are involved in coordination.

The airstrikes Saudi Arabia is conducting have produced one of the worst humanitarian situations in the world. Think about the reports on these different strikes.

There were 3 airstrikes in Sa’dah last month, killing 5 civilians and wounding 14 more, including 4 children, as well as killing the paramedics who were trying to pull the survivors out after the first bomb dropped.

We had a strike on a hotel last August that turned the building’s ceiling black with the charred blood of 50 farmers who were in that building.

It is one horrific circumstance after another as these bombs drop on civilians in Yemen. It is time for us to reckon with the fact of our participation in this carnage. This carnage has resulted in 10,000 Yemeni civilians killed, and there are 8 million people on the brink of starvation. Why is it that humanitarian aid has not gotten to those folks? Because Saudi Arabia has blocked it. We are partnering with a country that is blocking humanitarian aid. Does that square with the principles of the United States of America, to participate in partnership with a country starving 8 million people?

Then we have the fact that the Saudi bombs have been dropping on the infrastructure of Yemen, and they have destroyed the water systems. When you destroy the water systems, the sewage contaminates the fresh water, and a direct consequence of that is cholera. At this moment, the cholera epidemic in Yemen has affected 1 million people. That is the single largest cholera epidemic in the recorded history of mankind.

There are 8 million people starving and 1 million people sick with the worst cholera epidemic ever. We are participating in creating this.

To my colleagues who say Saudi Arabia has partnered with us against ISIS, fine and good, as they should. However, this issue is different. This is about whether we are helping them and participating directly in the hostilities of dropping bombs on civilians, Houthis, and creating a massive famine and a massive cholera epidemic and massive deaths. A lot of children are dying every day.

The Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, Mark Lowcock, warned that this famine could become “the largest famine the world has seen for many decades, with millions of victims.”

Every day, about 130 children die from hunger and disease. We pride ourselves on going to the assistance in the world when children are being slaughtered or starved or decimated by disease. In this case, we are participating in this carnage. Does any Member of this Senate want to stand up and say that is an appropriate mission for the United States to participate in, this carnage? I certainly hope not.

The death and destruction in Yemen is unimaginable. It is appropriate that we debate on the floor the Sanders-Lee-Murphy resolution, a bipartisan resolution to say: Let’s honor the Constitution. Let’s abide by the 1973 War Powers Act. Let’s hold the administration accountable because it is not just this issue—although this issue is massive—it is also the standard by which the Executive will operate in every potential war theater around the world for a decade to come.

If we proceed to say that it is OK that you trample the Constitution in Yemen, that you disregard the War Powers Resolution in Yemen, then we will be giving carte blanche to this administration to do so in one nation after another. We have long abdicated our responsibility. Let’s abdicate no more. Play the role, the responsibility the Founding Fathers gave us in the Constitution, and bring an end to our participation without authorization in this horrific conflict.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

S.J. RES. 54—MOTION TO DISCHARGE—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore.

JUDICIAL VACANCIES

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, 1 year ago today, the Senate Judiciary Committee opened its hearing on the nomination of Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch. The Stanford Law & Policy Review has now published my article on one of the opposition’s arguments made in that hearing and sure to be repeated should President Trump have the opportunity to make another Supreme Court nomination.

Today, I want to look at the lower courts because no fewer than 138 positions on the Federal district and ap-

peals courts are vacant. That does not include 33 vacancies that we already know will occur in the next year or so. Everyone must understand both the seriousness and the cause of this crisis.

By itself, 138 is just a number. It is a big number, but it needs a frame of reference or a standard for us to know whether this number of judicial vacancies is normal or a serious problem that has to be addressed. I certainly don’t want to be accused of partisanship, so I will rely solely on the standards and criteria used in the past by my Democratic colleagues. Let’s first use some Democratic standards to evaluate the number of judicial vacancies that we face today.

One standard is that the Democrats have specifically identified how many vacancies are unacceptable. In February 2000, with a Democrat in the White House, the Democrats said that 79 vacancies were “too high.” In September 2012, with the Democrats both in the White House and controlling the Senate, they declared a “judicial vacancy crisis” when there were 78 vacancies.

If 78 vacancies is a crisis, what is the label for 138 vacancies? This is the highest judicial vacancy total since September 1991, but more than half of those vacancies were fresh from Congress’s having created new judgeships several months earlier. So I think it is fair to say that in either total or percentage terms, we face today the most serious judicial vacancy crisis that anyone in this body has ever seen.

A second Democratic vacancy standard is that, as they did in April 2014, we can compare judicial vacancies today with vacancies at the same point under previous Presidents. If that Democratic standard is valid, vacancies today are 35 percent higher than at this point under President Obama and 46 percent higher than at this point under President George W. Bush.

There is a third Democratic vacancy standard. In June 2013 and at least as far back as April 1999, the Democrats have complained that the Senate was not confirming enough judicial nominees to keep up with normal attrition. Well, judicial vacancies today are 30 percent higher than when President Trump took office, and, as I said, at least 33 more have already been announced.

Finally, the Democrats have frequently said that the 107th Congress—the first 2 years of the George W. Bush administration—should be our judicial confirmation benchmark. During that time, the Senate confirmed an average of just over four judicial nominees per month. The Senate has so far confirmed 28 of President Trump’s district and appeals court nominees or fewer than two per month.

Take your pick. By any or all of these Democratic standards, we face a much more serious judicial vacancy crisis than in years past. In addition to the gravity of this crisis, however, the American people need to know its

cause. I can tell you what is not causing this vacancy crisis. President Trump started making nominations to the Federal district and appeals courts on March 21, 2017, just 61 days after taking office, as you can see on this chart. By August of last year, he had made more than three times as many judicial nominations as the average for his five predecessors of both parties. President Trump has nominated 86 men and women to the Federal bench since he took office 14 months ago.

If the President is making so many nominations, perhaps the problem lies somewhere in the Senate confirmation process. Once again, my Democratic colleagues can help figure this out. In November 2013, then-Judiciary Committee Chairman PATRICK LEAHY spoke about obstructing judicial nominees “in other ways that the public is less aware.” The Democrats are using such below-the-public-radar obstruction tactics at each stage of the confirmation process.

The first stop in the confirmation process is the Senate Judiciary Committee. Under Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY’s leadership, the committee has held a hearing for 62 of President Trump’s judicial nominees—more than under any of the previous five Presidents at this point. So that is clearly not the problem. The first sign of Democratic obstruction is the unwarranted and partisan opposition to reporting judicial nominations from the Judiciary Committee.

In February 2012, 3 years into the Obama administration, the Democrats complained that five nominees to the U.S. district court had been reported by the Judiciary Committee on a party-line vote. This, they said, departed dramatically from Senate tradition. Today, just 14 months into the Trump administration, eight nominees to the U.S. district court have been reported by the Judiciary Committee on a party-line vote. The present rate of such party-line votes in the Judiciary Committee is more than four times what the Democrats criticized just a few years ago.

The below-the-radar obstruction tactics continue when the Judiciary Committee sends judicial nominees to the full Senate. The Democrats, for example, refuse to cooperate in scheduling confirmation votes. They can’t prevent confirmation votes altogether because they abolished nomination filibusters in 2013, but if they can’t make judicial confirmations impossible, they are determined to make them very difficult. Here is how they do it.

The Senate must end debate on a nomination before it can vote on confirmation. The majority and minority have traditionally cooperated to end debate and set up confirmation votes. In March 2014, not for the first time, the Democrats said that refusing consent to schedule votes on pending nominees was obstruction. When the minority refuses that consent, the only way to end debate and set up a confirmation vote is by the formal cloture

process, which requires a cloture vote and can add up to several days to the confirmation timeline, as seen here.

Since President Trump took office, the Democrats have forced the Senate to take 28 cloture votes on judicial nominations, compared to just two cloture votes at this point under the previous five Presidents combined. Even when cloture is invoked, Senate rules provide for up to 30 hours of debate before a confirmation vote can occur. Nearly half the time under President Obama, a judicial nomination cloture vote was followed by a confirmation vote on the same day. Under President Trump, that has plummeted to 17 percent. The average time between cloture and confirmation votes for President Trump's judicial nominations is more than 55 percent longer than it was under President Obama.

When a judicial nomination gets out of the Judiciary Committee, survives an unnecessary cloture vote, and then is subjected to postcloture delay, Democratic obstruction is still not over. In March 2012, the Democrats complained about Senators having voted against nominees to the U.S. district court who were supported by their own two Senators. In fact, the Democrats called this a new standard of obstruction because it departed so far from Senate tradition.

OK. Let's assume for the moment that this Democratic standard is also valid. At this point in the previous five Presidencies—from President Reagan to President Obama—U.S. district court nominees had received a combined total of 10 negative votes. So far, under President Trump, his confirmed district court nominees have received 72 negative votes.

Two weeks ago, the Pew Research Center released a new analysis showing that President Trump's confirmed judges have "faced a record amount of opposition." In fact, this analysis concluded that President Trump's judges have each received an average of more than 22 negative votes, "by far the highest average for any president's judges since the Senate expanded to its current 100 members in 1959." This level of opposition is more than four times what it was under President Obama—or should I say oppositional delay.

These tactics don't involve high-profile filibusters or headline-grabbing confirmation defeats but, rather, internal Senate rules and unwritten traditions. That is why they operate below the radar. Yet the Democrats have criticized these tactics precisely because they take their toll. Individually and especially in combination, they can add days and weeks to the time it takes to confirm a single judicial nomination even when the final confirmation vote is unanimous.

In November 2013, for example, the Democrats said that taking cloture votes on unopposed nominees amounted to "obstruction and abuse of Senate rules." At that point, almost 4 years

into the Obama administration, the Senate had taken one cloture vote on a judicial nominee who was later confirmed without opposition—just one. We are only 14 months into the Trump administration, and the Democrats have already forced the Senate to take five cloture votes on nominees who were later unanimously confirmed. It has already happened twice this month. If doing this once amounted to obstruction and abuse, what would my Democratic colleagues call doing it five times as often in one-fourth the time?

These are just a few of what then-Chairman LEAHY called obstruction tactics that the public may not be aware of. Believe me. There is more where these came from. As I said, I want to avoid partisanship. Each of these is a Democratic standard. These are Democratic criteria. If my colleagues who once thought these were valid standards want to abandon them now, then perhaps they were also wrong the first time around. Otherwise, we have to face the conclusions that follow from applying these Democratic standards and criteria.

We face an unprecedented judicial vacancy crisis. Since President Trump is making nominations and the Judiciary Committee, under Chairman GRASSLEY's leadership, is steadily processing them, there remains only one explanation for the vacancy crisis we face today—plain, old-fashioned, partisan obstruction. The Democrats are manipulating this process at every stage, using the very tactics that they have loudly condemned in the past to make confirmations as difficult and time-consuming as possible.

Even in politics, actions speak louder than words. In July 2012, when there were 76 judicial vacancies, Chairman LEAHY said that "we should be doing better." Today, with nearly twice as many vacancies, I challenge my Democratic colleagues to put actions to those words.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. 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. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concern about the continued deterioration of the situation in Yemen and to share my views about the resolution that is currently before us.

The military conflict going on in Yemen has gone on for far too long and has affected tens of millions of civilians who face displacement, famine, and a widespread cholera outbreak. According to the United Nations, more than 15,000 Yemenis have been killed or injured since the war began in March of 2015. The humanitarian situation there has been described as the worst in the

world, with more than two-thirds of Yemen's approximately 29 million people facing severe food shortages. An outbreak of cholera has already infected at least 1 million people, marking the worst such outbreak in decades.

Continued instability in Yemen also benefits our adversaries. While we have sought to maintain pressure on al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, or AQAP, and ISIS, the lack of a functioning government or state security apparatus inhibits our ability to go after these groups. Additionally, it is clear that Iran has taken advantage of the current situation to spread its malign influence and provide lethal support to the Houthis, thereby further undermining regional stability and security.

Unfortunately, we have yet to hear any strategy from the administration as to how they would propose to use U.S. diplomatic leadership to help bring about an end to the conflict in Yemen. We still do not have an Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, and occasional visits by White House officials are not a replacement for sustained diplomatic efforts by our experts in the Foreign Service. I am encouraged, though, by the appointment of a new United Nations Special Envoy to Yemen, Martin Griffiths, and hope that the U.S. Government will seek to support his efforts wherever possible.

While the primary conflict in Yemen is between an Iranian-backed Houthi insurgency and a Saudi-led coalition, the United States is involved.

As stated in a letter sent by Secretary Mattis to congressional leadership last week, "Since 2015, the United States has provided limited support to Saudi-led coalition military operations to restore the U.N.-recognized government of Yemen and preserve Saudi territorial integrity from Houthi aligned forces in Yemen." Moreover, according to Secretary Mattis, U.S. forces are not authorized to use force against the Houthis but do support the Saudi-led coalition with "intelligence sharing, military advice, and logistical support, including air-to-air refueling."

Last week, the commander of U.S. Central Command, General Votel, testified before the Armed Services Committee that our support to the Saudi-led coalition is "primarily defensive" in nature and focused on the Iranian-supported ballistic missile threat to Saudi Arabia that originates in Yemen, maritime threats to international shipping in the Bab el Mandeb Strait and the Red Sea, the defense of Saudi Arabia's southern border, and counterterrorism.

However, General Votel also acknowledged that when the United States provides aerial refueling to coalition aircraft, we do not know where those aircraft then go; therefore, they could be going to conduct offensive strikes against Houthi targets, which may result in civilian casualties, which is a major concern for me. Even more troubling, if these aircraft went to conduct strikes against targets outside of

Yemen, the United States would be complicit in a much more dangerous and provocative activity.

I have significant concerns about persistent reports of civilian casualties and damage to civilian infrastructure caused by the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen. Far too many of the strikes by the coalition have killed or injured civilians and resulted in the destruction of infrastructure needed to provide basic services to the population, thereby exacerbating the humanitarian crisis.

It is also clear that more must be done by both the coalition and the Houthis to facilitate the flow of humanitarian aid into and throughout Yemen. The United Nations and humanitarian organizations continue to express concern about their ability to access seaports and airports and difficulties in distributing aid to vulnerable populations once it is inside the country.

It is important that shipments into Yemen be subject to inspection by the U.N. Verification and Inspection Mechanism to help prevent the transit of illicit materials in violation of the U.N. arms embargo, but all parties to the conflict in Yemen have a responsibility, including under international humanitarian law, to allow access to aid by those in need.

We are faced with a very difficult set of issues, and I certainly understand and commend my colleagues, Senators SANDERS, MURPHY, and LEE, for bringing this issue to the floor. The Saudi-led coalition clearly must do more to end this war and must prosecute this war in a way that limits civilian casualties and the humanitarian crises. On the other hand, Saudi Arabia and the United Emirates, or UAE, remain important partners for the United States, and we share many common interests in the region, including in the fight against al-Qaida, ISIS, and other violent extremist groups.

The resolution before us would establish a blanket prohibition on all assistance to the Saudi-led coalition except for the purposes of countering al-Qaida and associated forces. While I understand the argument for this approach, I believe it would prevent us from exerting influence to limit and hopefully end the conflict. Indeed, it may even cause harm as both sides potentially act more violently.

We can and should engage if there is a possibility that we can help minimize collateral damage by providing the coalition with training and advice on best practices. General Votel testified last week that U.S. assistance has contributed to improvement by the coalition on these issues. Specifically, the Department of Defense told us that engagement by U.S. military personnel has resulted in the introduction of a “no-strike” list. That is a process which actually puts targets off-limits and ensures that pilots and others understand those targets. They also caused a cessation—an ending—of the

use of cluster munitions by Saudi-led forces and the formation of a body to investigate noncombatant casualties. These are positive steps, but it is clear that much more must be done to minimize the impact of the war on Yemeni civilians. I support our continued engagement for that purpose.

Both Saudi Arabia and the UAE face a significant threat from Houthi rebels armed with ballistic missiles, apparently with the technical assistance of the Iranians. There have reportedly been dozens of attacks against Saudi Arabia since the spring of 2015, including against civilian targets like the international airport in Riyadh, which was attacked in December. I strongly support the right of our partners to defend themselves against these threats and believe that continued sharing of U.S. intelligence for defensive purposes is appropriate, especially in light of the fact that tens of thousands of U.S. civilians, military, and diplomatic personnel also face these threats while living and working in the region around Riyadh and throughout Saudi Arabia.

I also have concerns that ending all support to the Saudi-led coalition may cause the conflict to escalate. As Secretary Mattis wrote to congressional leadership this past week, restrictions on our “limited U.S. military support could increase civilian casualties, jeopardize cooperation with our partners on counterterrorism, and reduce our influence with the Saudis—all of which would further exacerbate the situation and humanitarian crisis.” Secretary Mattis also expressed concern that withdrawal of our support would “embolden Iran to increase its support to the Houthis, enabling further ballistic missile strikes on Saudi Arabia and threatening vital shipping lanes in the Red Sea, thereby raising the risk of a regional conflict.”

Therefore, I believe that support by the U.S. military of the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen should not be absolutely prohibited but should be explicitly limited to the following objectives: No. 1, enabling counterterrorism operations against al-Qaida and ISIS; No. 2, defending the territorial integrity of Saudi Arabia and the UAE, including against ballistic missile threats; No. 3, preserving freedom of navigation in the maritime environment around Yemen; and No. 4, enhancing the training and professionalism of their armed forces, with a primary focus on adherence to the law of armed conflict and prevention of civilian casualties.

Our support for the Saudi-led coalition needs to be considered in a thoughtful and deliberate manner. From a policy perspective, we should distinguish between assistance that is provided for defensive or noncombat purposes and that which could be used to enable offensive military operations in the Yemeni civil war.

Let me be clear. I am not in favor of giving the Saudi-led coalition a blank check. In fact, I believe we should no longer provide aerial refueling assist-

ance unless it is used to enable aircraft conducting counterterrorism missions pursuant to the 2001 authorization for use of military force or countering specific identified threats to Saudi territorial integrity. Indeed, use of our military assets to support Saudi-led coalition efforts or the efforts of other nations to conduct other operations outside this narrow scope would raise very serious legal questions.

Given its comprehensive approach, I do not believe the Sanders resolution is the appropriate vehicle for these issues to receive the careful and deliberate consideration they are due. I understand the Foreign Relations Committee may soon take up this issue, and I urge them to do that. I look forward to engaging further in those discussions when presented with the opportunity.

The administration must make clear to both the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis that there is no military solution to this conflict and that the time has come to reach a negotiated settlement. Congress also has an important role in setting the policy framework for the use of U.S. Armed Forces overseas and ensuring that U.S. military capabilities are only used for authorized purposes. At the same time, we should not take action that would unduly restrict our engagement with partners for legitimate purposes and, in doing so, undermine our ability to help bring an end to the conflict in Yemen, ease civilian suffering, and defend the territorial integrity of our partners.

With that Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is about time we had a debate, if only for a few hours, on the participation of the U.S. military in the civil war in Yemen. Frankly, I cannot comprehend nor am I able to explain to my Vermont constituents the ongoing involvement of U.S. troops in support of the Saudi-led coalition as it flies U.S.-origin planes and drops U.S.-made bombs—purchased at a discount thanks to American taxpayers—amid continued reports of indiscriminate targeting and horrific civilian casualties.

These are not isolated incidents in Yemen. They have occurred time after time over the past 3 years. Houses, health clinics, and markets are destroyed, millions of people uprooted from their homes. Whether extreme negligence or intentional and a war crime, the effect is the same for those who are killed, wounded, or displaced. There is no evidence that U.S. military involvement nor the recurrent appeals of international humanitarian and human rights organizations has improved the situation.

This is not just a matter of the carnage we have observed. It is that we are supporting these military operations at all. Only Congress has the power to declare war, and the ongoing participation of U.S. forces in the Saudi-led coalition’s war against the

Houthis in Yemen clearly meets the definition of the “introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities” under the War Powers Resolution. The War Powers Resolution also authorizes Congress to direct the removal of U.S. forces if their introduction has not been authorized by law, as is the case in the war against the Houthis.

That is why I support the resolution before us, S.J. Res. 54, which would exercise Congress’s prerogative to limit the involvement of U.S. forces, in this case to the narrow purpose of combating al-Qaida, which does serve our national security interests in the region. I recognize, as some others have pointed out, that the war in Yemen is part of a larger conflict of interests and ideology between Iran and Saudi Arabia. If there are other legitimate and compelling national security interests that justify the deployment of U.S. forces in that region, let us debate them.

We should also be doing more to demand greater transparency and accountability for civilian casualties in Yemen, regardless of the context in which they occur. If the Saudis want U.S.-taxpayer subsidies, they need to focus their efforts on terrorists, take effective steps to minimize civilian casualties, and credibly investigate such casualties when they occur.

I have heard Senators who oppose this resolution say they intend to hold hearings and focus more attention on what is happening in Yemen. I welcome that, but I have to wonder why it has taken so long and whether anything will change as a result. Yemen has been a humanitarian disaster for years, and there is no end in sight. The Foreign Relations Committee should have held hearings and voted to invoke the War Powers Resolution when the U.S. military first became involved in Yemen.

This is not a new crisis, and other than the increasing toll of death and destruction, the facts on the ground have not materially changed. The Saudis have seemingly done nothing to improve the conduct of their air force in Yemen.

The least we can do is support this sensible resolution to put an end to the unauthorized involvement of the U.S. military in this civil war, as the War Powers Resolution compels us to do. The alternative is conceding unchecked power to the executive branch to use U.S. troops in support of any armed conflict, without congressional debate or authorization. That is just what the War Powers Resolution was designed to prevent. It is time to live up to the responsibility entrusted to us in the Constitution. Only Congress can declare war. If we are unwilling to do so, we have no business asking the men and women of the U.S. military to risk their lives in Yemen today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. BOOZMAN. Thank you, Mr. President. As you know, our Chamber

is focused on a heavy subject at the moment—human trafficking.

An estimated 25 million people are victims of human trafficking all around the world. Smuggling people for forced labor and sex slavery is a heinous crime. It is the kind of crime that we tend to think happens in some far-off place, but these atrocities are happening all across the globe—sadly, including, unfortunately, here in the United States. In fact, human trafficking appears to be on the rise in our country, according to data released by Polaris, which shows a 13-percent jump in cases reported to the help lines it runs.

Since Polaris began operating over 10 years ago, its help lines have received reports of 203 cases of human trafficking from my home State of Arkansas. Almost half of those were reported in the last 2 years. Fortunately, our State is fighting back. Last year, Arkansas legislators approved a law requiring State-licensed truckers to be trained in spotting the red flags of human trafficking. Using their position on the road, these drivers have the tools to recognize the signs of human trafficking and alert the authorities to any suspicious activity.

Congress is also increasing its efforts to combat human trafficking. In September, the Senate unanimously passed two pieces of legislation to renew existing programs in support of survivors and help bring perpetrators of these horrific crimes to justice.

The Abolish Human Trafficking Act provides more resources to law enforcement in its effort to combat human trafficking and establishes human trafficking justice coordinators at every U.S. attorney’s office and at the Department of Justice. In addition, the legislation helps survivors rebuild their lives by extending the Department of Justice Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act reauthorizes key programs to help survivors in their recovery, as well as offering specialized training on human trafficking to judges and Federal investigators.

We have made progress, but more needs to be done, and the legislation on the floor this week will help by giving law enforcement and prosecutors additional tools to crack down on crimes involving exploitation of the vulnerable. It will help us to take on nefarious actors like Backpage, which hid behind the Communications Decency Act to avoid prosecution for trafficking crimes.

It is time to rip the cover away from these bad actors. We are going to do that by making narrowly crafted changes to the law to ensure that websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking online are held accountable. “Knowingly” is the keyword here.

During the last session of Congress, the Homeland Security Committee, under the leadership of Senators PORTMAN, MCCASKILL, and JOHNSON,

uncovered just how much Backpage knew. It was a lot. In fact, Backpage’s operators helped customers modify their ads to hide references to underage prostitutes. I think we can all agree that rises to the threshold of knowingly facilitating sex trafficking online.

Should this bill pass—and I believe it will in a very bipartisan way—these bad actors will not be able to fade quietly into the dark, as we are going to give State attorneys general the authority to prosecute websites that violate sex trafficking laws. That is why I support this bill. That is why I cosponsored similar legislation here in the Senate. It is also why I supported the inclusion of at least \$90 million in Federal funding to combat human trafficking. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I will continue to support funding for these important programs, and I look forward to the Senate’s completing work on fiscal year 2018 funding bills.

I am pleased to see all levels of government lending their support to help fight this crime. Together we can end this attack on human rights in our State, our country, and around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in light of the vote later today on the Sanders-Lee-Murphy legislation, or S.J. Res. 54, I rise today to discuss the situation in Yemen and the path forward. As many know, over the last year I have focused persistently on the humanitarian crisis in Yemen.

My activities have been manifold. I have issued letters to the administration and the Saudi Government, an administration nomination, hearings, a Senate resolution, and countless meetings, briefings, and phone calls with senior administration officials, Saudi officials, and leaders of the NGO community.

My goal? My goal has been to address impediments to the delivery of humanitarian assistance—food, fuel, and medicine—into the country of Yemen.

Now, we have seen some progress, and I have been encouraged by this. The USAID-funded World Food Programme cranes have been delivered, and the Red Sea ports have been opened. According to the United Nations, since the ports were open, we have seen more than 884,000 metric tons of food and more than 410,000 metric tons of fuel delivered to the ports of Hodeidah and Saleef alone.

Of course, we understand the importance of the food. But why is the fuel so important? Well, without the fuel, you can’t run the water treatment facilities and, therefore, the cholera epidemic that has broken out in Yemen will only get worse. So 884,000 metric tons of food and more than 410,000 metric tons of fuel have resulted in the saving of countless of lives in Yemen.

Look, there is a continued humanitarian crisis in Yemen. A lot of problems persist, and we need to address those. We have seen progress with respect to the delivery of some of the humanitarian assistance I mentioned, but commercial and humanitarian vessels have been offloading their lifesaving cargo less quickly than we would like. So there is a lot left for us to do.

The National Security Council presidential statement issued on March 15 related to Yemen indicated that there are still over 22 million people in need of humanitarian assistance. This is the world's largest humanitarian disaster. The risk of famine persists for millions of Yemenis.

The Saudi-led coalition continues, unfortunately, to impose unacceptable delays on ships carrying food and fuel into Yemeni ports. According to the U.N., the Saudi-led coalition caused 5.9 days of additional delay in the month of February on ships going to the major ports of Hodeidah and Saleef. Those delays continue this month.

Now, why does this matter? Well, this matters, of course, because we don't want people to suffer. It is inconsistent with our basic human values. It is inconsistent with what we Americans believe. When people suffer, it also exacerbates a national security crisis. It facilitates radicalization.

In fact, last week I chaired a Foreign Relations Committee subcommittee on this very topic—the connection between food insecurity, specifically, and the instability or radicalization of those who are food insecure. The hearing demonstrated that there is now a strong, evidentiary, and academic basis to conclude that it is in America's clear national security interest to address food insecurity, as well as a lack of fuel and medicine. A retired Marine Corps general testified at that hearing, Lieutenant General Castellaw. I thought he put it succinctly. He said: "Food crises [can] grow terrorists." Well, we have seen a lot of terrorists grown in Yemen in recent years.

The longer the civil war persists in Yemen, the worse the humanitarian crisis will grow. This will radicalize yet more people and provide even further opportunities to Iran to undermine our national security interests and those of our partners.

What are our objectives in Yemen? That is a fair question. It is one that all of us as policymakers and, really, all Americans ought to be asking. Well, consistent with our humanitarian principles and our national security interests, I believe we have to continue to pursue two primary objectives. First, we want to address the largest humanitarian crisis in the world, and, second, we want to press all parties to end the civil war.

The real question here—because I don't think there is agreement on those two primary objectives—is how can we best achieve these two goals? That takes me to the Sanders-Lee-Murphy resolution before us today. We, of

course, need to fulfill our article I constitutional responsibilities. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution indicates that it is Congress's responsibility to declare a war, and it is Congress's responsibility to authorize the use of military force. I share Senator LEE's conviction, Senator SANDERS' conviction, and Senator MURPHY's conviction that we need to take that responsibility very, very seriously. This is why I introduced an authorization for the use of military force last year. It is also why I have been working with Chairman CORKER of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator KATINE, and other members of the committee to break a logjam in negotiations—some principled disagreements that exist with respect to what the authorization for the use of military force should look like moving forward.

We have finalized an updated AUMF against Islamic terrorist groups like al-Qaida and ISIS that will merit consideration in coming weeks. In fact, we heard from Chairman CORKER. He has now offered a public assurance that there will be hearings on the issue of authorizing military force and there will be marking-up and reporting of legislation so that this 17-year-old authorization for the use of military force can be re-upped. My own view is that whatever one thinks of the legal merits of this long war under the authorizations given in 2001 and 2002, the further away we get from that point in time, where a past Congress authorized force, the more attenuated that argument is and the less power it has. Moreover, we owe it to the men and women in uniform to consistently debate our involvement in overseas conflicts. So I commend the chairman for agreeing with other members of the committee that we need to have hearings and to pass legislation specifically on this matter through the committee of jurisdiction through what we call regular order.

Let me share with those who are watching my remarks here today what I believe the wrong approach is. I believe S.J. Res. 54 is the wrong approach. That resolution sidesteps the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It doesn't lead to the sort of fulsome debate. It doesn't allow us to hear from professional witnesses and members of the administration the way a formal committee hearing and markup would allow.

Moreover, the legislation is never going to become law. It will never become law. It is an exercise in messaging. Now, messaging is important. We need to make the argument, and I respect my colleagues for making their principled arguments. They are strong in conviction, and they make each of them quite articulately. But the administration has already indicated that the President wouldn't sign this into law. The administration has already indicated that they do not regard, under the law, that we are engaging in hostilities, which is required to

trigger the law they have invoked. So this will never become law.

Moreover, we most certainly will not be overriding a Presidential veto should this pass out of the Senate and the House and go to the President, whereupon he would veto it. So this will never become law.

The last reason I think S.J. Res. 54 is the wrong approach is because it will not achieve our shared objectives. It would fail to achieve its stated objective because the administration rejects the premise of the Sanders-Lee legislation related to hostilities, as I have already stated.

So there is a better approach. Rather than just criticizing S.J. Res. 54—and let me be careful to distinguish between criticizing the legislation that we will be voting on later and my colleagues, because I have great respect for my colleagues and their motives. I wanted to play a more constructive role in this debate. So I wanted to introduce legislation that would provide leverage to pressure the Saudis to actually end the civil war in Yemen and to actually improve the humanitarian situation. At the same time, we have to acknowledge and respond to Iran's malign behavior in Yemen, as well as the presence in Yemen of ISIS and AQAP—al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. This is arguably the most aggressive and most dangerous al-Qaida franchise in the world. We also have to recognize Saudi Arabia's legitimate right to not have ballistic missiles launched into their cities. This is our partner.

So I wanted to develop a bipartisan compromise that could actually pass out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, be passed by both Chambers, and signed by the President of the United States. I think we are well on our way to doing that. I wanted to develop legislation that would actually further its stated purpose and our objectives in Yemen—ending the civil war and addressing the humanitarian crisis.

So that is why I and Senator SHAHEEN introduced S.J. Res. 55 on March 8. Now, since then, we worked with the committee, we have worked with members of both parties, and we have worked with the administration and outside experts to further refine our legislation, making numerous substantive changes and principled compromises.

The current version of our legislation would require the Department of State to certify in an unclassified and written report that Saudi Arabia is undertaking the following: No. 1, an urgent and good-faith effort to conduct diplomatic negotiations to end the civil war in Yemen; No. 2, appropriate measures to alleviate the humanitarian crisis in Yemen by increasing access for Yemenis to food, fuel, and medicine, including through Yemen's Red Sea ports, the airport in Sana'a, and external border crossings with Saudi Arabia; and, No. 3, demonstrable action to reduce the risk of harm to civilians and civilian infrastructure resulting from its

military operations in Yemen, including by complying with applicable agreements and laws regulating the use of cluster munitions and other defense articles and services purchased or transferred from the United States.

Now, if the Department of State can't make that certification, then U.S. air refueling missions, which are essential to the Saudi coalition's operations, would end. They would be prohibited under our law. Given the humanitarian crisis in Yemen and our national security interests there, I appreciate Chairman CORKER's commitment today to mark up Yemen legislation in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when we return from recess in April.

So based on this reasoning, which I have laid out quite clearly here today, I plan to oppose the Sanders-Lee-Murphy legislation today. Instead, I will support legislation like ours that could actually become law and would provide the administration the leverage they need to result in real change in Yemen.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I note that the Senator who was to be on the floor is not, so I ask to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to participate in the discussion on the conflict in Yemen.

In 2015, I received a phone call from a Saudi official informing me that the kingdom was about to take military action in Yemen. The official said the conflict would not last long. They would launch airstrikes to push the Houthis out of Sana'a, restore Hadi to power, and broker a political compromise. That was nearly 3 years ago, and the conflict has since grown into the world's worst humanitarian disaster.

More than 10,000 civilians have died, and more than 40,000 have been wounded. More than half of Yemen's healthcare facilities have been destroyed. Three-quarters of the population—almost 22 million people—need humanitarian assistance. Eleven million require urgent assistance to survive, which means they are close to starvation.

The situation for children is especially dire: 1.8 million children under the age of 5 are malnourished. Of that, more than 400,000 are so malnourished that they are now 10 times more likely to die.

On top of the bloodshed and famine, the people of Yemen are facing a horrific outbreak of cholera. More than 1 million cases of cholera have been reported, potentially the worst cholera outbreak in world history. More than 2,200 people have died from it, almost one-third of whom are children. Cholera has spread because more than 80 percent of the population lack clean drinking water.

We can't turn away from suffering because we are a party to this conflict. The United States is providing intelligence, military advice, logistical support, and aerial refueling to Saudi Arabia. The fact is, we are enabling a major proxy war between Saudi Arabia and Iran.

We do all that despite there being no military solution. This has not been a brief war. It has turned into a major war that must end. The longer we permit suffering to continue, the more innocent men, women, and children are going to die. Instead of facilitating endless fighting, we should be pushing for reconciliation.

I have personally urged Saudi and Iranian officials to meet to discuss their differences. To my great disappointment, they have refused to do so. Iran is expanding its influence across the Middle East. It continues to arm Hezbollah, back President Assad in Syria, and support the Houthis. Saudi Arabia and its partners will not back down. Just last week, Crown Prince Salman said his nation would pursue the same nuclear capabilities as Iran. What does that say to us?

Their fight in Yemen offers no military solution. Only a political resolution will end this miserable war.

It is time we separate ourselves from this bloodshed. The United States must make it clear that we will not continue to support unending conflict. That is why I support the Sanders-Lee resolution, which would require the United States to stop refueling Saudi and Emirati aircraft.

Now, this seems like just a small step, and it certainly will not immediately end the war, but it is a deeply symbolic one. This resolution will send a clear message that we will no longer enable this proxy war.

There is no reason a diplomatic solution can't be found to end this violence, and a strong push for reconciliation will save the lives of thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children in Yemen, but that peace is only achievable if we speak with one voice and pass the Sanders-Lee resolution, otherwise we will continue to enable this barbaric war.

Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor with a series of my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Democratic side to enter into a colloquy about this administration's chaotic and incoherent approach to foreign policy—an approach that has left our allies confused and our adversaries emboldened and undermines the standing of the United States on the global stage.

To be fair, the President's own national security strategy echoes decades of bipartisan recognition that the founding values of the United States—democracy, the rule of law—should continue to drive our foreign policy.

Yet the President himself has shown a fundamental disrespect for these very principles: declining to publicly champion the importance of human rights and good governance, refusing to condemn dictators around the world who brutally repress their own citizens, sow instability across the world, or even attack those who attack the United States—something I fear will ultimately weaken our ability to promote the security and prosperity of all Americans.

Last week's unceremonious firing of our Nation's top diplomat was the President's latest and brazen example of disrespect for the role of diplomacy, diplomats, and of the State Department itself. While I had my differences with Secretary Tillerson, the reality is, it does not serve the interests of the United States when the President undermines his top diplomat on major foreign policy initiatives, from the crisis in the gulf to, ironically, his outreach to North Koreans.

Secretary Tillerson's legacy will be shaped not just by the President's misguided efforts but also his own ill-advised attempt to dismantle the State Department, leaving the United States without key voices to advance our interests around the world.

The administration has failed to even nominate critical, high-level positions—Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries—leaving a void of empowered voices. Meanwhile, there are gaping vacancies in some of the world's most troubled regions. For example, as we confront a nuclear-armed North Korea, the President has yet to nominate an ambassador to South Korea, our critical ally on the peninsula—one that has historically relied upon American assurances and allegiance.

Similarly, the President took more than a year to nominate an Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. The impact of these vacancies was on full display last week when the President—without the knowledge of his top diplomat—announced a meeting with North Korean Dictator Kim Jong Un, an assertion that was then ultimately walked back and modified by his Secretary of Defense and his White House Press Secretary.

In the Middle East, as the President continues to send more and more American troops and we face an emboldened Iranian regime creeping further into Syria, facilitated by the Kremlin's military support, he has yet to appoint Ambassadors to consequential posts, including Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar, Turkey, and Jordan, which has proved a critical partner in our fight against terrorism in the region and in supporting refugees—two essential components of U.S. policy in the Middle East.

How can we possibly expect to assert American leadership and secure our interests with these posts unfilled and with no empowered individuals at the Department itself? Under the President's watch, the number of career Ambassadors, which is basically the State

Department's equivalent to four-star generals at the Department of Defense, has plummeted by 60 percent. If we were shedding four-star generals this quickly, we would be sounding the alarm of a national security crisis.

We have just one career-level Ambassador left at the State Department. Let me say that again: One career-level Ambassador left, and this administration has seen fit to ship him off to an academic institution rather than to engage him in frontline diplomacy.

We are witnessing a mass exodus of experienced diplomatic and security professionals who have dedicated their lives to this country. This is a forced exodus, and I am deeply alarmed to see reports revealing what we have feared for some time.

We just started to learn about disturbing efforts to purge the Broadcasting Board of Governors and impose a partisan editorial voice on U.S. international media. Alarming, last week, press reports highlighted emails that provided concrete evidence of the administration's efforts to effectively purge the Department of anyone they do not believe would be a purist for the President's vision. Emails showed political leadership describing some civil servants as "turncoats, leakers, and troublemakers."

The conversations showed senior political appointees working with outside organizations engaged in vicious smear campaigns against career civil servants and dismissing death threats against some of these same career officials. Diplomats who have served Republican and Democratic Presidents alike, who have spent their careers working to build a more prosperous and secure world so a Commander in Chief would not have to send our sons and daughters into war.

This is America. Our government functions because of apolitical civil servants across agencies who dedicate their lives to advance the interests of their fellow citizens, from distributing Social Security checks to negotiating nuclear arms treaties. It is outrageous. It is disgraceful. It is dangerous.

We face challenges from every corner of the globe. We simply cannot confront them if we are not present, and we cannot overcome these challenges when the President himself does not acknowledge them.

As China's political leadership consolidates power and as the country expands into the South China Sea and pursues an aggressive economic agenda around the world, the President, for his part, praises these dictatorial moves. Meanwhile, he has failed on his promise to deliver better trade deals.

In Latin America, while the President calls our neighbors to the south drug dealers, criminals, and rapists, China is expanding its economic and cultural presence in our own backyard.

In Mexico, one of our most integral bilateral partners—Mexico is the second largest market for U.S. goods and services in the world—we will soon lose

our Ambassador, as we hear about how the Russian Government is seeking to interfere in their upcoming elections.

When it comes to Russia, again and again, the President's own intelligence officials have made clear that the Russian Government not only meddled in our election in 2016 but continues its interference in the American political system to this day. Yet the President refuses—refuses—to condemn Vladimir Putin or impose congressionally mandated sanctions to hold them accountable for their attack on the United States. I understand today he congratulated him on his "election." That is not an election. Putin is seeking to be a czar, not to be a President.

The Russian Government continues its military aggression in the Ukraine and its disinformation campaigns across Europe.

In the Middle East, it continues to enable Bashar al-Assad's slaughter of innocent civilians and Iran's efforts to expand its presence and threaten Israel. In a brazen move this month, the Kremlin used an unlawful chemical agent to commit murder on British soil, showing how far they will go if they are unchecked.

Beyond these great power threats, we must also confront nonstate actors and new tools designed specifically to destabilize free and democratic societies.

We must demand more information to learn about Cambridge Analytica and the efforts of this organization to exploit private information from social media users across the world to promote particular political agendas.

The only way to confront old and emerging threats is to stand united with our allies. We have spent decades building these alliances based on mutual respect, accountability, and vigorous engagement in the international institutions and security agreements that are essential to promoting peace and security around the world. We ourselves must be a reliable ally and partner. We must speak with an authoritative voice. We must have our national security agencies executing clear, integrated, coherent strategies.

The President himself must champion the fundamental ideas that have made America secure and prosperous: democracy, human rights, free expression—values we champion not because simply they are right but because they are also strategic. We stand for these values because, globally, governments that uphold the rule of law, that respect human rights and freedom of expression, that welcome economic competition—these are the nations that form America's most reliable allies, most prosperous economic partners, and most strategic security relations.

Let me close with this: The American people and the institutions we have built remain resilient. Now more than ever, Congress must exercise its role as a coequal branch of government when it comes to our foreign policy. We need Republicans and Democrats in Congress to uphold our duty to conduct

oversight, to ensure that bipartisan values that have guided American foreign policy for decades can be executed by an experienced, empowered, fully funded and fully staffed State Department.

Together, we must ensure that our reputation as a leader of nations is not eroded by a President and an administration that thus far, in my view, far from putting America first, threaten to leave America isolated and behind. That is our challenge. That is our choice. I appreciate my colleagues who join us in this regard.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I would like to say how glad I am to have Senator MENENDEZ back in the saddle as our ranking member on Foreign Relations, and I thank him so much for his speech and for his leadership on our very important committee.

I join my colleagues from the Foreign Relations Committee in their critique of President Trump's handling—or maybe we would call it mis-handling—of foreign policy. I am most concerned about how U.S. power, prestige, and diplomacy have been weakened across the world as a direct result of this President. The United States has stood as a world leader of liberal democracy, the rule of law, and human values since the end of World War II. Our actions abroad have not always been perfect, but over the decades, we have earned the world's respect because we have acted on our principles.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, authoritarian regimes were in retreat. Today, authoritarianism is back on the march. The President himself even cheers them on, praising Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping, and others who fashion themselves President for life of one-party, repressive regimes.

In this President's short but raucous and chaotic tenure, he has diminished our standing within the world community by grossly offending other nations and their leaders, including many of our closest allies, by abruptly changing foreign policy with no clear policy basis, and by denigrating countries and an entire continent with comments laced with racism. The President issues conflicting messages. World leaders and international diplomats cannot rely on his word or his tweets. He has plenty of criticism for our friends and allies but little for strongmen like Vladimir Putin. The world is alarmed. It is less stable under this Presidency.

Secretary Tillerson had disagreements with the President, and early on, the President undercut and sidelined him. The day before Mr. Tillerson was shown the door, the Secretary broke with the White House by directly pointing the finger at Russia for using a chemical weapon on the ex-British spy in his homeland, and this incident shows that the President will not tolerate daylight between his own corrupt

political beliefs and the views of his lieutenants.

During confirmation hearings for Mr. Pompeo, our committee must find out whether he will hold fast to traditional American values or bend to the President's servility to Vladimir Putin and other autocrats around the world.

The President's own diplomacy has been chaotic and dangerous. He has alienated one of our closest friends and biggest trading partners—the country of Mexico. He insists that Mexico will pay for this offensive wall that he says is necessary to keep out rapists and criminals.

The President has imperiled our relationships with both Mexico and Canada with his threats to tear up NAFTA, which he seems to say over and over again. In my home State of New Mexico, border communities rely on the integrated border, and border communities rely on the economy that has been built up over the last 24 years. We have a trade surplus with Mexico. NAFTA negotiations continue, but there has been a chill on economic activity in States like New Mexico, Texas, California, and Arizona.

The President has shaken the world with his grade-school taunts about nuclear weapons—a deadly serious subject. He chided Secretary Tillerson that talking to North Korea won't work, undercutting the Secretary once again, and then suddenly agreed to meet and even negotiate with Kim Jong Un without the careful diplomatic work needed to ensure success. I support diplomacy as the best solution, but rash diplomacy can easily lead to rash wars, and impulsive decision-making is extremely risky.

I hope the President seriously studies the issues between now and any meeting, brings an experienced team, and sets realistic and achievable goals for any negotiation. He must understand that diplomatic failure is potentially catastrophic. A war would likely result in 20,000 casualties a day in the opening week, and Secretary Mattis has warned that there would be, in his words, “the worst kind of fighting in people's lifetimes.”

I do not trust this President to follow the constitutional process required to go to war. That is why I am cosponsoring S. 2047, prohibiting any President from launching a preemptive strike on North Korea. Starting a war with North Korea would only undermine the security of the United States and our regional allies and should not be done without approval of the American people through the Congress.

The President's attitude toward Russia and Vladimir Putin complicates our ability to gain support for our efforts overseas. Russia interfered with our democracy and continues to interfere in the affairs of our allies.

There is no good explanation why he has not directed our Nation's security agencies to take all possible action in response to Russia's interference with the 2016 election, and increasingly we

see in the special counsel's investigation how Russia is playing a bigger and bigger part. There is no reason why this administration took so long to begin to implement Congress's sanctions against Russia. Special Counsel Mueller's investigation has already produced indictments against Russians and key officials from President Trump's campaign, but the President himself does not send the message to deter future interference by Russia. The President's failure to fight back, his resistance to sanctioning the Russians, and his subservience to Putin betray the national trust.

The President's hostility toward Iran's agreement to disarm its nuclear weapons program is mind-boggling. Director Pompeo reportedly shares this hostility. But just last week, the commander of U.S. Central Command, Army GEN Joseph Votel, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the Iran deal is in our national interest. Defense Secretary Mattis and the Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman, Gen. Joseph Dunford, also agree. Our close allies—also signatories to the deal—agree it is in the international community's interests.

This is not the United States the world has come to know, rely upon, and believe in. The President's failure to protect our national interest weakens our position within the world community.

Morale at the State Department is suffering as our foreign policy suffers. Any new Secretary of State must work to reverse this. This Congress and the world have watched as the President and the Secretary of State have hollowed out the State Department.

Highly experienced and talented Foreign Service officers have been fired, pushed out, reassigned to menial tasks, and ignored. Many senior diplomats have just packed up and left. Nicholas Burns and Ryan Crocker, who served as Ambassadors in both Republican and Democratic administrations, have warned that “we are witnessing the most significant departure of diplomatic talent in generations.” On top of retirements, the number of people who took the Foreign Service exam dropped by more than half between 2016 and 2017. There is real concern that this will have a lasting and negative impact long after the Trump administration.

Director Pompeo will need to answer tough questions during confirmation: Will he impose congressionally mandated sanctions on Russia? What actions will be taken to counter Russia's ongoing cyber warfare? We are on the razor's edge with North Korea. As chief diplomat, does he support a preemptive strike against North Korea? What will he do to avoid a disaster? Does he agree with our military leaders about staying in the Iran denuclearization deal? Will he certify Iranian compliance if the facts show compliance? Does he support the President's proposal to decimate the State Department's budget? Will he continue Secretary

Tillerson's plan to decrease staff by 8 percent? What will he do to recover agency morale, which we hear over and over is at an alltime low? Will he stand up to this President when long-held American values are at stake?

Director Pompeo will need to prove to the Senate that he will put the State Department and the U.S. standing in the world back on track. Our international partners do not view the United States as the reliable and strong partner they had in the past. Dictatorships and harsh regimes are emboldened by our lack of attention to free speech and human rights.

President Ronald Reagan said at the Berlin Wall that “the totalitarian world produces backwardness because it does such violence to the spirit, thwarting the human impulse to create, to enjoy, to worship.”

Dictators now smirk and echo our President, saying “fake news” about any news outlet that shines a light on their indiscretions. Leaders like Vladimir Putin are emboldened to continue to try to undermine our democracy and sow conflict and division within the American public.

The world is less stable without a strong, principled United States to lead. It is imperative that the United States preserve and strengthen its diplomatic power, not sabotage it.

With lack of leadership in the executive branch, Congress must step up, particularly the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As I said at the beginning, I am so pleased that Senator MENENDEZ is back to work with Senator CORKER to try to assert the role that Congress should be playing in these very important issues.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New Mexico, a key member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, for his insight, input, and continuing efforts to make sure we have a diplomacy in the world that ultimately pursues our national interests and security.

I understand there are some colleagues who are on their way to the floor—Senator SHAHEEN and Senator CARDIN. When they get here, we will hopefully have the Chair recognize them at that point.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. 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. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator MENENDEZ, the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and my colleagues from the committee to talk about the importance of diplomacy as

we look at the many challenges and conflicts that the world is facing right now.

From North Korea to Syria to Venezuela, there is really no end in sight for growing tensions and conflict in the world. Our military presence in Afghanistan is growing, we have approved lethal weapons for Ukraine, and we are forging a new partnership with NATO in Iraq. I support these efforts, but without a vigorous diplomatic capability to back our military, these initiatives risk failure. Sadly, instead of providing for a robust diplomatic corps, the administration has laid the foundation for a weakened U.S. hand on the international stage. Ultimately, this places Americans at risk. As Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis said, it forces his men and women to buy more bullets. Equally critical is the opportunity this provides for the great power conflicts to continue and to fester.

In November, I wrote to then-Secretary of State Rex Tillerson with the Senate Armed Services Committee chairman, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, to express bipartisan concern over the administration's State Department hiring and promotion rates. I was told that the statistics we had received from the American Foreign Service Association were wrong and that the redesign of the State Department is not forcing anyone from their jobs.

Unfortunately, since that time, the State Department has lost even more precious, diplomatic talent. Congress has received a budget request that cuts even more personnel, and Foreign Service hiring and promotion rates continue to plummet. Last month, the highest ranking senior Foreign Service officer, Tom Shannon, announced that he, too, would be retiring. With his retirement, we will have no senior Foreign Service officers serving in the Department's leadership.

To date, we have only one active career ambassador who will serve in the entire State Department, and he is not even working in the building. Aside from the mass exodus of critical talent, we are allowing decades of investments made by our country and our diplomats to dwindle along with their ranks.

For the past 2 years, the Senate has also received abysmally low budget requests for the State Department and USAID.

Meanwhile, our problems aren't declining. The Kremlin continues to sow chaos across the globe. China increasingly flexes its muscle by buying strategic properties throughout Europe, Africa, and the Middle East. We are facing the greatest refugee crisis since World War II. Our intelligence community repeatedly warns that in this year's midterm elections, Russia will repeat another hybrid operation against the U.S. election. The obvious response to these challenges should not and cannot be to reduce the operational capacity and personnel of the lead agency that is responsible for alle-

viating global crises and promoting the United States' public face throughout the global outreach. That is the State Department.

Just this month, the New York Times revealed that the State Department had failed to spend any of the \$120 million allocated to fund the Global Engagement Center, which is aimed at countering state-led misinformation campaigns. While America is under attack and Western democracies are under attack by misinformation campaigns, the State Department's response has been totally insufficient. It has been not to spend any of the money that Congress has allocated. It seems the administration is completely unaware of Special Counselor Mueller's indictment against Russia's Internet Research Agency.

I wish to spend a minute to read from excerpts of Mueller's indictment of 13 Russians, which came out last month. If we can look at this through objective eyes, it reminds us all of the threats we face because of Russia's interference.

This is stated in Mueller's document:

The [Internet Research Agency] is a Russian organization engaged in operations to interfere with elections and political processes.

I am quoting now from the indictment.

By in or around September 2016, the [Internet Research Agency's] monthly budget for Project Lakhta (its interference operation in the U.S.) exceeded 73 million Russian rubles (over 1,250,000 U.S. dollars).

They are spending, on a regular basis, 1.25 million in American dollars on this interference operation. For all of the people out there who think this is a partisan issue, this is not a partisan issue. This is an issue about interfering in our democracy. We can see how much they are willing to spend to do that.

Continuing to quote from the indictment:

Defendants and their co-conspirators also traveled, and attempted to travel, to the United States under false pretenses in order to collect intelligence for interference operations.

In or around 2016, the defendants and their co-conspirators also used, possessed and transferred, without legal authority, the social security numbers and dates of birth of real U.S. persons without those persons' knowledge or consent. Using these means of identification, defendants and their co-conspirators opened accounts at PayPal; created false means of identification, including fake driver's licenses; and posted on Internet Research Agency-controlled media accounts.

That is the Russian entity that is doing this.

Think about that. We know of the Kremlin's efforts to influence and use the American people to its own advantage. It is laid out pretty clearly in this indictment from Robert Mueller. Yet, somehow, the State Department is incapable of spending \$1 of the money that has been allocated by Congress toward countering Russia's most overt, public messages against the United States.

This is truly remarkable and, sadly, disappointing. The American people deserve better. Unfortunately, the Global Engagement Center is not alone in its lack of support from the administration. According to an analysis of data from the Office of Management and Budget, last year the State Department spent just 79 percent of the money that Congress had authorized for the conduct of foreign affairs, the lowest level in the last 15 years.

Many of us on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would agree that most of our greatest global achievements—the Marshall Plan, the end of the Cold War, and the reduction of nuclear weapons—have been secured through diplomacy. Without it, I fear we will stray far from President Trump's ideal of brokering deals and instead cause irreparable damage to one of America's most precious resources—our diplomatic corps. That will harm this country's standing in the world and will have us viewed as weak by our great power adversaries.

The hollowing out of the State Department under this administration will cause irreparable damage to America's diplomatic efforts, and it will harm our country's standing in the world. Congress has to step in and make sure this doesn't happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and under the leadership of Senator MENENDEZ to point out that now—I guess it has been 14 months under President Trump's leadership—we have seen a dramatic shift in U.S. foreign policy that jeopardizes our standing globally and our national security. It starts with this administration's hollowing out the State Department and our capacity to participate in diplomacy.

As my colleagues have pointed out, so many vacancies exist today, unfilled by this administration. It is not the slowness of the Senate in confirming the positions. Many of these positions are not even positions that require Senate confirmation. We have seen an exodus of the most experienced people in the State Department, and the capacity of the State Department has been dramatically reduced. President Trump's budget speaks volumes about his support for diplomacy, as we see 30-percent reductions in the State Department budget being proposed by this administration.

The role of diplomacy in solving international issues is at an all-time low. There are many times I disagreed with Secretary Tillerson, but he at least was an independent voice in the White House as it related to certain issues on Iran or climate change. Now his voice has been silenced in this administration.

America first is America alone. It is the isolation of our country. We have seen that with the United States under

President Trump and pulling out of the climate talks—the only country in the world. We see it now, potentially, in Iran, with reports that the President may unilaterally withdraw the United States from the nuclear agreement, putting the United States as the outlier where we should be putting our attention on Iran. This is reflected in the Gallup polls, showing that the global opinion toward the United States has dropped dramatically. We see the President embracing oppressive leaders around the world, such as the leaders of Russia, China, Turkey, and Egypt, and embracing the autocratic practices of the President of the Philippines. Then, he attacks our closest allies, calling into question the transatlantic partnership.

Perhaps more than anything else, this administration has trampled on America's values. As Secretary Tillerson said early in this administration, America's interests will no longer be dictated by our values. That is not what the trademark of America is about. The President over and over has questioned universally what America stands for when he gave space to hate in his response to Charlottesville and when he implies that people who come to our country of certain religions or certain races are less favored than others. When he suggests he cannot have a conflict because he is President of the United States and does not have to divest of his business interests or when he says things that we know are not true and the President of the United States is standing up for matters that are outright lies, it diminishes the value and strength of America and our global leadership.

One issue I want to talk about in the time I have is that of ignoring one of our greatest national security threats—what Russia is doing to the United States under Mr. Putin. We just saw in Russia's most recent election that it was neither free nor fair. The opposition candidates were not allowed to participate, as they were handpicked by Mr. Putin, and he controlled the media. As the OSCE observed, the election took place in an overly controlled legal environment, and it had pressure on the critical voices of the Russian people.

We find a Russia today under Mr. Putin that is contrary to the values we stand for. In January, I authored a report on Russia, with the other Democrats on the committee, that talked about the asymmetric arsenal Mr. Putin uses that includes propaganda. We saw this on display when he was asked about what happened in the United States. According to the transcript, as reported by the Washington Post, these are Mr. Putin's own words: "Maybe they're not even Russians," in his talking about who attacked our country and referring to those behind the election interference. "Maybe they're Ukrainian, Tatars, Jews—just with Russian citizenship." He also speculated that France, Germany, or

Asia might have interfered in the election or even Russians who were paid by the U.S. Government.

That type of rhetoric is straight out of the Soviet and Russian playbook to cast Jews and other minorities as undesirables—enemies of the state. As an American Jew who has family roots in Eastern Europe and Russia, I find that kind of rhetoric to be dangerous and frightening, but at its most basic, such rhetoric is part of Mr. Putin's grand design. That is what he does.

We saw it play out in the UK just 2 weeks ago when a person was poisoned in England who was an enemy of Mr. Putin's. We see it play out over and over again. Prime Minister May spoke out. She called it for what it was. She sent a clear signal to Moscow that that type of behavior by the Russian state against the British people would not be tolerated and that there would be consequences. This is how a leader of a great nation should speak out in defense of its people to counter a major threat from a global adversary.

Yet what happened here in Washington with the threat we saw to our own country by Mr. Putin? The President has said virtually nothing. His spokesperson condemned the crime but ignored that likely Russian link. The Secretary of State later did what the President could not or would not do by calling out the Russians. Maybe that was his swan song because it was the last thing we heard before he was silenced by Mr. Trump.

Never before in America's history has such a clear threat to our national security been so clearly ignored by the President of the United States. The President's difficulty in publicly acknowledging the Russia threat and leading our country forward to combat that threat is one of the most perplexing and reckless pieces of Mr. Trump's disastrous foreign policy. We in Congress took action. We passed legislation. We passed mandatory sanctions against Russia. Yet this administration has not taken full advantage of the law we passed. The President needs to protect America's interests, not appease Mr. Putin.

Congress's role in shaping and advancing U.S. foreign policy has never been more important. I will continue to advance legislation, conduct oversight, and speak out about these important issues in the name of the American people and the values and norms that define us and our place in this complicated world. I am proud to be a part of the group of Senators who will stand on this floor and work to make sure we protect our national security interests.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to share my deep concern over the Trump administration's approach to North Korea.

I thank the Senator from New Jersey, the leader of the Democrats on the

Foreign Relations Committee, for asking the Members to come out here to speak to the Trump administration's foreign policy.

North Korea is a serious and ever-worsening threat to its people, to our allies and partners in the region, and to the United States. Unfortunately, the Trump administration has mismanaged our North Korea policy, and the potential consequences of failure are too great to ignore. North Korea may have bent over backward to appear conciliatory during the Winter Olympics and through its offers of talks with South Korea and the United States, but Kim Jong Un has not stopped his dangerous activities—far from it. While the North Korean regime is all smiles and open arms, its malign behavior continues.

Its engineers race to perfect a nuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missile. North Korean laborers around the world—modern-day indentured servants—send paychecks home to the regime to help fund its illicit military programs. Illegal ship-to-ship transfers of refined petroleum products continue. North Korea's army of cyber warriors grows more capable, and the Kim regime's thugs make no efforts to scale back rampant human rights abuses.

However, President Trump's approach to date threatens to make an already bad situation even worse. Despite his recent announcement that he would accept a meeting with Kim Jong Un, President Trump has systematically undermined the effectiveness of the very agency—the U.S. Department of State—he will need to make talks successful. By so doing, he has harmed U.S. foreign policy right as the United States is poised to embark on a crucial diplomatic effort with North Korea.

By firing Rex Tillerson, President Trump threw the State Department further into chaos when what we need right now is more consistency. This is indicative of a President who considers himself to be his own diplomat, negotiator, and strategist. Yet the gutting of the State Department goes much deeper. It has been badly depleted of both staff and resources by the Trump administration and is consistently ignored in the opaque process the White House is using to try to conduct American foreign policy.

President Trump has stifled dissent, ignored experience, politicized key diplomatic and national security agencies. The Special Representative for North Korea Policy, Ambassador Joseph Yun—the lead American negotiator with North Korea—has stepped down. One wonders whether he felt his advice was being heeded. We still don't have a U.S. Ambassador to South Korea more than a year into the Trump administration. We still don't have a confirmed Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. We still don't have a special envoy for North Korean human rights issues. We no longer have a sanctions coordinator.

Going into talks at the senior-most level with a hollowed-out State Department is no way to peacefully resolve a crisis. To the contrary, it exposes us to greater risk, and as if these vacancies were not enough, it gets worse.

The Trump administration's recently released budget request for fiscal year 2019 would drastically cut State Department funding. The State Department is already alarmingly underresourced and understaffed to handle the significant and increasing threats from North Korea. Yet there is no explanation as to why the President believes it is prudent to cut diplomatic resources, especially in the middle of a crisis.

We deserve an answer as to why the administration believes the State Department deserves fewer resources while trying to execute a wide-ranging strategy of diplomatic engagement and pressure. All the while, the White House is subjecting our allies and partners to contradictory statements that cause confusion and dampen the prospects of a peaceful solution.

We hear different thoughts on different days. Before firing him, President Trump routinely undercut Secretary Tillerson and, with it, our diplomatic high ground. Confusing our allies in South Korea and Japan, whose assistance in helping resolve the North Korean crisis is indispensable, only serves to embolden Kim Jong Un, who seeks to drive a wedge between the United States and our allies.

We cannot afford to fail. I am concerned that if these talks do not go well, President Trump will be able to claim he tried both economic pressure and diplomacy, with neither path having solved the problem. He will be left with the conclusion that the only approach remaining will be military force. We must be clear. There is no military solution to the North Korea crisis.

Today marks the 15th anniversary of the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Although the current situation we face with North Korea is not identical to the one we faced in the runup to the Iraq war in 2003, the North Korea situation is, in fact, worse, and the consequences are even more severe. Unlike Iraq, North Korea has nearly completed the development of long-range nuclear-armed missiles that will be capable of creating nuclear mushroom clouds in our cities.

We all agree we need to act to ensure that this never happens. The only responsible course of action is for the administration to use all tools of American statecraft to reduce the threats from North Korea. We have an obligation to American families, service-members, and our allies to say, unequivocally, that we did everything in our power without resorting to armed conflict.

Let's return the United States of America to the forefront of statecraft and allow for our diplomats to advance our interests without having to risk a

frivolous loss of life. That is what is at stake as the President moves further away from using the kinds of tools which are available that can try to peacefully resolve this conflict with North Korea.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators COONS, CARDIN, LEE, SANDERS, and I be recognized for up to 5 minutes each and then Senator CORKER be recognized for up to 15 minutes prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I just returned from a trip to a major transatlantic conference in Europe. While the Europeans have spent a lot of time over the course of the last 12 months hand-wringing about whether the United States is committed to Europe, committed to NATO, committed to our common defense, my feeling upon going to Brussels for this particular conference is, they are kind of over the hand-wringing. They are now just making plans to move on without us. They are making plans to protect themselves without us. They are making plans to set the rules of the road economically, politically, and culturally around the world without the United States. The evidence of that was very clear.

The Europeans are setting up something called the European Defense Initiative, in which they are going to start doing military planning and purchasing outside of NATO because they are just not convinced, not confident that the United States is going to be seriously engaged in NATO. That compromises our security as the Europeans start to make plans for their defense without us, even though we still have an obligation under the treaty to protect them.

Over and over, you see the world moving on as they watch this massive withdrawal of America from the world. The President said at a rally in Alabama a few months ago that the world is starting to respect the United States of America again. That could not be further from the truth. The Pew organization charts other countries' opinions of the United States. It also charts whether other countries believe the United States is going to act in the best interests of the world. The numbers are, frankly, startling.

Of the 37 countries they surveyed, only two of them have higher confidence in the United States under Trump than they did under Obama. One is a rather statistically significant increase, that being Russia, which by 42 percentage points is more confident that the United States is going to act in that country's best interests. South Korea had 88 percent confidence under Obama and has 17 percent confidence

under Trump. Canada had 83 percent confidence under Obama and has 22 percent confidence under Trump. Germany is 86 to 11. They have come to this belief because, as my colleagues have mentioned, the Trump administration had signaled its unwillingness to try to set a moral tone for the world in the way that it budgets. The budget they presented to us reduces accounts dedicated to countering Russian aggression around its periphery by 63 percent. It is a clear telegraph to Europe that they are on their own, that countries that are trying to fight back against a country that wants to reestablish a new version of the Soviet Empire will have no help from the United States.

In this budget, the National Endowment for Democracy is cut by \$100 million. It is no secret that countries like Hungary and Poland are starting to slip away from traditional democratic norms. Countries like the Philippines are doing the same because there is not a moral force here in the United States committing to bring them closer to the ideals of participatory democracy.

There is a \$1.6 billion cut in humanitarian aid, telling the rest of the world: If you want to solve these enormous problems of humanitarian catastrophe—famine and refugee displacement—you can't look to us anymore. You are on your own again.

There is a 35-percent cut in overall international narcotics and law enforcement funding, just at a time when record amounts of fentanyl are finding their way into the United States.

The moment of panic is over for the world. They have watched this administration walk away from its traditional obligations to try to stand up for the rule of law, to try to promote democracy and human rights, and to try to protect America's interests and our allies. They are simply making other plans. I hope the next administration will be able to correct that, but those plans are hard to break once they are made.

I hope Republicans and Democrats will stand up to make sure that America does not become any weaker in the world than it already is today, 15 months into this administration. We are less safe as a nation because of this wholesale withdrawal from the global stage. It is not too late to try to turn it around.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on the floor this afternoon to address the mounting concerns we have with the foreign policy of the Trump administration. I want to thank my colleague, Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and comment at the outset on two things that have been widely said that I don't think are true.

First is that Democrats are bottling up the President's vitally needed nominees for senior ambassadorial positions

or senior Department of State nominations and that we are holding key nominees.

Frankly, nothing could be further from the truth. Earlier today, in a business meeting, our Foreign Relations Committee, which works well on a bipartisan basis, voted out a whole series of Ambassadors, treaties, and Assistant Secretaries of State.

Second, I heard it said by some pundits that Democrats wish President Trump ill, that we are working to do everything we can to hold him back and prevent him from being successful.

Let me start by saying that I think all of us know that we are strongest when we stand together and work together. All of us have at some point heard the old adage that politics should stop at the water's edge, and nothing would make me happier than to see our foreign policy, our military, and our diplomatic efforts succeed around the world.

I do not wish our President ill or our State Department a lack of success, but I think it deserves mentioning for the few minutes I am taking on the floor today that President Trump, who promised as a candidate to be unpredictable and nontraditional, has overperformed in that category. His foreign policy has been defined by inconsistency, volatility, unpredictability, and at times, a failure to advance our values. This comes exactly at a time, as my colleague from Connecticut was just reciting, when our allies and partners crave stability and leadership and when the threats to our democratic way of life from Russia and China are on the rise.

Trump's "shock and awe" style of governing was demonstrated recently by his abrupt firing of the Secretary of State in a tweet and his further humiliation of the Secretary of State in stories that dribbled out about exactly how and when and where he was fired. We should not be conducting foreign policy in the same way that one might host a reality TV show like "The Apprentice."

In just a year, as I have attended a variety of conferences and meetings around the world, I have been struck by the number of ways in which the President has undermined alliances and friendships that have taken decades to build. Let me briefly review a few of the ways our European and Asian allies have been puzzled or confounded—by our withdrawal from the Trans-Pacific Partnership; by imposing a travel plan on citizens from majority Muslim countries; by withdrawing from the Paris climate accord; by imposing tariffs on steel and aluminum, including against our close North American and European allies; by questioning our commitments to NATO; and by denigrating an entire continent when discussing the value of potential immigrants from Africa.

Real and consistent leadership around the world that reflects American values is needed now more than

ever. In the dozen countries I have visited for regional security conferences in the past year, I have heard the same from our vital allies. Senator MCCAIN and I traveled to Halifax in Canada and to Singapore in Southeast Asia for a series of bilateral meetings of representatives of close and trusted allies. Senator FLAKE and I have traveled to Africa. Senator GRAHAM and I have traveled to the Middle East. In all of these trips, what I have heard is that our allies are concerned, that they need reassurance about how and where we stand, and that in many cases, yes, they are beginning to move on past us and to reach accommodations with China or Russia, having concluded that we are not committed to engagement with the world.

Every time I go on a visit to a foreign embassy—an embassy of the United States overseas—I sit down with our Foreign Service officers and I ask about their work and service, and I am overwhelmingly impressed with the professionalism and dedication of our career development professionals and our diplomats. Yet, overwhelmingly, the big number of vacancies at the State Department and a budget that proposes a more than 30-percent cut in the State Department and USAID have had a significant, demoralizing impact on these people whom we count on to advance America's interest and values around the world.

Let me also say briefly that on the continent of Africa, where I have spent a great deal of my time on the Foreign Relations Committee, we are missing Ambassadors to some of the biggest and most important countries—South Africa and Tanzania being just two, for example. It is a continent where China's pervasive presence is not being countered by an America that is robustly engaged. Why does this matter? Because in this century, Africa will become the fastest growing and largest market for our goods and should be the continent in which we have the closest alliances and partnership. But instead of building partnerships and helping to extend markets here at home, the Trump administration is squandering the current momentum and watching from the sidelines as democratic norms deteriorate.

As a member of both the Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees, I was gravely concerned that for a second year in a row, the Trump administration budget proposed deep cuts in diplomacy and development. We must recognize that while these investments serve a humanitarian purpose, they also make us stronger by spreading American values, safer by building coalitions, less susceptible to terrorism by creating a more stable world, and more prosperous by creating stronger export markets for our goods. If we want to remain a global leader, we need a strong State Department and USAID that are sufficiently funded.

Let me turn to the matter of Russia before I conclude. Throughout his ad-

ministration, President Trump has not only turned away from some of our critical allies and weakened our commitments to international coalitions but has also refused to head-on, clearly address the real and multifaceted threats we face from Russia.

Russia's activities, as has been testified to by senior administration officials over many hearings, now are directly interfering with our democracy—our last election and likely our next election, as well as those of our closest allies throughout the world. Rather than sending a clear and forceful signal to Russia that our political affairs are not to be meddled with, President Trump has instead at times turned aside from this challenge and failed to address it.

Let me conclude by simply saying that now more than ever, the United States must lead in the world, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee on a bipartisan basis to advance our interests.

Thank you, Mr. President.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time because I think this issue is an extremely important issue. I am talking about the authority of the Congress of the United States versus the President on the introduction of our troops into war or hostilities. This has been a struggle we have been debating for a long time. Congress passed the War Powers Act over the objections of the President because we recognize that the Constitution gives us the power to introduce troops into harm's way.

The resolution says very clearly that the introduction of the U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities will allow Congress to have an expedited process if the administration has not gotten the authorization for the use of that military force. The Supreme Court decision made it very difficult for us to enforce that, causing us to pass, in the State Department authorization, a process in which a joint resolution could be filed in order for Congress to express itself if the President has not sought the authorization for the use of military force.

We now have a circumstance where the United States, in my view—the President has introduced American troops into hostilities by assisting the Saudis in refueling missions in regard to the campaign in Yemen. To me, that is introducing troops. Whether it is right or wrong, Congress has a responsibility to respond to this. I say that knowing that our Presiding Officer has been very articulate about the need for us to pass an authorization for the use of military force in regard to our campaign against ISIS.

Here is the challenge we have. The administration and previous administrations have interpreted hostilities in such a narrow way, it would take away

from Congress our ability to have the authorization for the introduction of American troops into hostile circumstances. Yet compare that with this administration's and previous administrations' interpretations of the 2001 authorization for use of military force, which we passed after the attack on our country on 9/11. They would have you believe that authorization, which was limited to those who planned the attack against us in 9/11, applies to our military campaign against ISIS in Syria or ISIS in Yemen or wherever we may find ISIS anywhere in the world. I think that is an absurd interpretation.

Yes, I know the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is on the floor. I think our committee needs to take up this issue. We need to take up what is happening in Yemen with our support of the Saudis and what is happening in regard to the authorization for the use of military force. But this campaign has been going on for a long time. Congress needs to weigh in whether we are for or against it. We need to exert our jurisdiction, and we haven't done that. It is very frustrating that those of us who believe very deeply in our constitutional responsibilities, assume that responsibility—and I have a lot of confidence in the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but I question whether we are going to get more time in the future to debate this issue. I know the chairman will give us time in committee, but will we have time on the floor of the Senate to debate this issue? I think we need to debate it and vote up or down whether American troops should be assisting in this mission.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand to urge a "no" vote on the motion to table. We are involved as cobelligerents in hostilities in someone else's war—in a civil war in Yemen.

It is very difficult to dispute the contention that there is no decision made by a government that is more severe, more serious, that carries with it more dire consequences than sending brave young men and women sworn to protect us into harm's way, into battle, into hostilities.

We have been faced with the debate here about what amounts to hostilities. We have the executive branch of government that understandably has defined that term narrowly but in this case so narrowly as to obliterate any meaning behind that word, basically suggesting that we are not in hostilities unless we have people on the ground firing upon an enemy and being fired upon. That is not always the way modern warfare is conducted and hasn't been for some time.

The fact is that we have our uniformed military personnel who are engaged in things like midair refueling

on combat missions, refueling the combat aircraft of another country when those combat aircraft are in route to a battlefield, to a theater of warfare. If those aren't hostilities, I don't know what is.

We have been told that we need to do this in regular order. Let's talk about regular order for a minute because, as I mentioned a moment ago, there is nothing more serious than sending our uniformed military personnel into hostilities. We have in this body adopted laws and procedures making it possible for us to receive fast-track consideration of measures that indicate that the executive branch of government has overstepped its power.

We are in our third year involved in this civil war in Yemen—3 years—and yet this hasn't come up for a vote; 3 years and we haven't had anything come out of committee and voted on the Senate floor. Three years ought to be long enough. In fact, the War Powers Resolution gives us expedited consideration. It gives the committee 10 days to consider that. The committee has now had more than twice that time to consider that, and the committee has not put anything out. This is why we are well within our rights, well within the boundaries of what is appropriate, in fact, and well within what the Constitution already grants us, which is the power to declare war. That power, with good reason, was not vested in the executive branch of government. It was vested only in Congress—that branch of government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals.

The reason this is so important is that before we send our young people into a place where they could die, we want to make sure that an open, honest debate is held in public view, not behind closed doors at the Pentagon or at some other government office building, but right here on the Senate floor and in the House of Representatives. We cannot exercise that power capably, we cannot claim to be mindful, and we cannot be deemed faithful to our oath to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States if we don't look out for our authorities and if we don't make sure that someone else isn't exercising authority that was granted to this body. That authority belongs not to any one person; it belongs to the people.

If we refuse to take this vote today, if we choose instead to table this measure rather than to allow it to come up for a vote on the Senate floor, we are choosing not to decide, and we will still have made a choice—a choice to abdicate our responsibility. If we make that decision today, then shame on us. It is our prerogative as a coequal branch of government to make sure that we do our job, to do that which only Congress can do.

This is, in fact, a war. There are, in fact, grave humanitarian concerns presented by that war, and that makes it all the more important, not less impor-

tant, for us to debate this and for us to discuss this under the light of day, in public, and on the Senate floor.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest terms I am capable of communicating to vote against the motion to table.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I have enjoyed hearing the discussion about the item before us. I must say that I would feel a whole lot better about this debate if it were focused on our refueling French jets going into Mali—the same exact debate. I assume these individuals would consider those to be hostilities, but, somehow or another, that doesn't rise to congressional approval.

This one, I think, is politically tinged. Saudi Arabia certainly has issues. They have conducted themselves in manners that we wish were better. The Crown Prince was here today, and all of us who met with him "demarched" him, if you will, on the conduct relative to Yemen. Yet, at the same time, we know that because American folks are involved in refueling and because we are helping, to a degree, with intelligence, we know that less civilians are being killed there. We know that. We know that our being there has affected their conduct.

I wish to talk about process here. The sponsors of the resolution, who I have great respect for, have used a very entrepreneurial method to bring this to the floor, and I don't say that to be pejorative. They have reached into the War Powers Act and pulled out something that was unintended for this purpose. I think everyone understands that, and I think everyone understands that if we don't table this, we will be setting a precedent here. It will be a situation of first impression where from now on, when our Air Force is refueling jets in the air, we are involved in hostilities. I don't think that is a standard that we wish to set.

I want to argue this on a different level. It is hard for me to believe that we would take up an issue of this serious nature and not allow the committee of jurisdiction to work its will. We had a hearing last week that Senator MCCONNELL set up for all Senators to come in and be briefed on Yemen. His stated reason for doing that was that most people in the Senate don't know much about what is happening in Yemen. People on the Foreign Relations Committee do, and the people on Intel do, and the people in Armed Services do. But most of the Senate has not really been involved recently in that issue.

Typically, the way we work around here is that the committee does its work. It does its recommendation. It works with the administration, and you come forth with a piece of legislation. Can we imagine, for instance, with tax reform, if we just had some kind of entrepreneurial way of bringing tax reform to the floor without the Finance Committee working, or bringing

FISA to the floor without Intel working? That is not the way we are supposed to do things here.

So we have a bill that is being generated right now—it is a bipartisan bill—by JEANNE SHAHEEN and TODD YOUNG. It may not be the bill we deal with on Yemen, but it is just now being developed.

By the way, I skipped a beat here. I want to refresh people's memory as to what we are voting on. We are not voting on anything but a decision to discharge the Yemen issue from the committee without the committee taking any action, without the committee having any hearings. This is a vote to say that we are going to skip the Foreign Relations Committee and we are going to set precedent here on the floor in this entrepreneurial way and that we have reached into the War Powers Act to find a clause to bring it to the floor, which was never intended for this purpose.

So what I would say to people is that a better way of handling this would be to table this motion, to let the Foreign Relations Committee do the work that you have assigned the Foreign Relations Committee to do. We are going to have a hearing on Yemen. We have a piece of legislation that is being developed in a bipartisan way, with the Republicans and Democrats, to deal with this issue. Let us work our will in the appropriate way—by the way, in a way that actually will generate an outcome.

In addition, I know there are Members on the floor who have been frustrated, as someone referenced earlier, that the 2001–2002 AUMF is still being used. The Presiding Officer has been very involved in trying to develop a new AUMF that would supersede those two AUMFs and give the Senate and the House the ability to weigh in every 4 years on these types of actions. We are going to have a markup on a bill that our Presiding Officer, Senator KAINE from Virginia, Senator YOUNG from Indiana, and many people have been involved in. That markup is going to take place on April 19.

So, hopefully, the Senate will not only have an ability to deal with a real bill on Yemen that actually will generate a real outcome coming through committee but also will have the ability to deal with an AUMF that will set aside the fact that for years the Congress has not weighed in on this issue. To me, that is a much better outcome.

I urge everyone in this body, instead of following this unique process that is not going to generate an outcome regardless, to allow the Foreign Relations Committee to do its work and to bring a bill to the floor that will generate an outcome. I am going to make a motion in a moment to table it, but I realize there may be one more speaker before I do so.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief moment?

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the leadership of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I agree with his proposed outcome on this vote. That is not to diminish the importance of the issues raised by the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Vermont, but I do agree with him that it is the preferred, careful, cautious way of dealing with competing interests in a complex world.

I just ask the Senator further to that point whether he can confirm my understanding that actually using this unique process—is it his understanding, as it is mine—that there would actually be a vote-arama; that is, we would end up voting on multiple different proposals, not just this one proposal, and create perhaps some confusion and some more chaos in what is admittedly a complex and sensitive foreign relations and national security matter?

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, that is correct.

So, in closing, I would just ask—just like every other committee here in the Senate that hopefully takes its work seriously and does work especially on important matters like this that affect people's lives—that this body would think that a better recommendation would be to table this effort to have this wild West debate on the floor over the course of the next several hours and, instead of doing it in that manner, to give the committee of jurisdiction the ability to work its will with Yemen through hearings, through a process on the committee that would actually bring a bill to the floor that has been thought through and where we had worked with other bodies of government to get it in a place where then it could be amended and dealt with in a more methodical and appropriate way.

I would like to remind people one more time that we also plan to mark up an AUMF on April 19 to deal with the lingering issue of having an open situation where we are still dealing with ISIS and al-Qaida and others based on something that was authorized to be done in Afghanistan years ago.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the resolution that we will soon be voting on is really very simple. It has two basic points. Point No. 1, I and the 14 other cosponsors of this resolution believe that under the definitions laid out in the 1973 War Powers Resolution, U.S. forces have been introduced into the Saudi-led war in Yemen, a war which is causing a humanitarian disaster.

I would say to my good friend Senator CORKER, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that this war has been going on for 3 years. Some 10,000 civilians in Yemen are dead and 40,000 have been wounded. A million are dealing with cholera right now, and millions have been displaced.

You come tonight on the floor and you say: We are going to hold a hearing. That is good, but it is 3 years too late.

The issue that we are dealing with right now is whether or not the U.S. Senate and the U.S. Congress accepts its constitutional responsibility on the issues of war. This is not a complicated issue, and I don't think anybody here disagrees. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution says not that the President can make war and send our young people into harm's way. It is the Congress of the United States that should make war.

Our role now in Yemen working with the Saudi-led intervention there is one of hostilities under the War Powers Resolution of the United States. It is not just my view on this. As many may know here—as I suspect the chairman of the committee knows—last November, by a vote of 366 to 30, the U.S. House of Representatives agreed with the essence of what Senator LEE and I are trying to do, and the House passed a nonbinding resolution stating that U.S. involvement in the Yemen civil war is unauthorized. Every Member of the Democratic leadership voted for that, as did the Republican chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, ED ROYCE.

An editorial in the New York Times today states:

The United States initially deployed forces to combat Al Qaeda in Yemen under post-Sept. 11 congressional authorization measures. But Congress never specifically approved military involvement in the Saudi-Houthi war even though the Constitution and the 1973 War Powers Act give lawmakers a role.

The New York Times:

For too long, Congress has abdicated its role as America prolonged its stay in some wars and expanded into others. And presidents have been too reluctant to share these crucial decisions with lawmakers. Resolutions like this—

The one we are debating—

can and must force serious debate and accountability.

I say this to my friend the chairman: I think now of the two major foreign policy disasters that have taken place in our lifetime—No. 1, the war in Vietnam. In that war—a Democratic administration under an otherwise very good President, Lyndon Johnson—he and the Secretary of Defense misled and lied to the American people with regard to the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. That is now established fact as a result of declassified information. The United States got sucked into that war, and my generation—the young men of my generation—suffered so terribly. Over 60,000 died, and many others came home wounded in body and in spirit. The U.S. Congress abdicated its responsibility at that point in 1964.

Fifteen years ago—oddly enough, on this day—there was the war in Iraq, under a Republican administration, and the administration lied to the American people again. Where was Congress getting the facts? We had the

Vice President of the United States: Oh, Saddam Hussein is building weapons of mass destruction. There is a connection between Saddam Hussein and Iraq and the 9/11 perpetrators.

It was a lie. It was a lie. Mistakenly, Congress voted to approve the war based on false information.

So what I say today is that it is time for the Congress to accept its constitutional responsibility. I don't know how well we will do. Maybe we will screw it up as well. It is very possible. But that is what the Founding Fathers suggested, and I think they were right. We are closer to the people—the House and the Senate—than is the White House, this White House or any other White House.

So there are two issues today. Do we accept our constitutional responsibility to vote on matters of war? I would suggest that every Member of the Senate vote yes. Don't duck your responsibility. Don't abdicate your responsibility. Second of all, this war in Yemen, in my view, has been a humanitarian disaster as a result of Saudi intervention. But the most important vote is, do we actually have a vote on whether American troops are involved in the war in Yemen?

I hope very much we will vote against Senator CORKER's motion to table, and I hope that after we do that, we will vote for the resolution that says it is time for the United States to get out of Yemen.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, very briefly, I just want to set the record straight. The House of Representatives voted to say that the war in Yemen is not covered by the 2001–2002 AUMF, and I think this body would agree. They did not do as was just mentioned by the Senator from Vermont. As a matter of fact, they decided not to take up this measure that we are taking up today because they thought it was not a good measure to take up.

I don't want anybody in this body to think that the House has already supported this effort. The House not only didn't support it, they wouldn't take it up because they thought it was damaging to our country's foreign policy.

I hope that today people will join me in voting to table this motion and to let the committee do its work as it is supposed to do. Let's bring something to the floor that will actually have an outcome, and then let's have a debate down the road on the AUMF—the 2001 and 2002 AUMF—which I hope will be given floor time.

With that, I think all time has expired.

Mr. President, I move to table the Sanders motion to discharge S.J. Res. 54, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

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 result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote 58 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Reed
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeben	Sasse
Coons	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Jones	Thune
Cotton	Kennedy	Tillis
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Whitehouse
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Nelson	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Harris	Paul
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Lee	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkeley	Warner
Feinstein	Moran	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

ALLOW STATES AND VICTIMS TO FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, last night I came to the floor to talk about legislation we are debating in the Senate this week that has to do with combating human trafficking, an issue that every Senator in the Chamber cares about. Last night, I talked about some of the women and children who have been exploited online, their stories—some of the heartbreaking stories.

This opportunity we have before us is to pass legislation that addresses that very directly because we are seeing in this country, in this century, unbelievably, an increase in trafficking right now. The experts all say it is for one primary reason; that is, because the trafficking is moved online.

The ruthless efficiency of the internet, the dark side of the internet—Mr. President, you have been involved with this issue in our committee. As you know, we spent a couple of years coming to this point, an 18-month investigation of what is happening online,

why it is happening, and then coming up with a legislative solution. The reports of human trafficking to one of the major anti-trafficking groups in the country, called Polaris, through their hotline and through their text line, have increased 842 percent over the past 10 years. This is consistent across the board in talking to other experts. There is this increase. When they look at it, where they see it is happening is online. Victims have told me, have told you and other Members, this has now moved from the street to the smartphone, from the street corner to the internet.

According to National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, nearly 75 percent of the child trafficking reports it receives from the public involve one single website; that is, backpage. That is why we spend a lot of time looking into backpage, why this was happening, and how we could address it.

According to Shared Hope International—another advocacy group—the number is even higher than 75 percent. We researched this through a process that many in this body were involved with. CLAIRE McCASKILL was the ranking member of the Permanent Subcommittee On Investigations. We investigated that. I see she is on the floor now. She and I, along with our subcommittee, along with you, Mr. President, and other members of the full committee, looked into this issue. What we found was even more shocking than we expected. We knew people were being trafficked online by this website. We knew they had to be complicit with some of this. What we didn't know was they were actually taking ads and altering the ads, editing the ads to try to hide the fact that people were selling underaged girls online. As they put it, they were cleaning the ads for illegal transactions and then covering up the evidence of these crimes in order to increase their profits.

Last night, I talked about three brave mothers who shared the tragic stories of their daughters who were exploited and sold for sex on backpage.com. Their daughters were between the ages of 14 and 16 when they were trafficked. Kubiiki Pride was one of the women we talked about. She is also part of a documentary called “I am Jane Doe.” It tells the stories of her family and other families. It is a powerful, powerful presentation, and it is powerful in that you can feel their frustration, feel their pain. It is not easy to see, but it is important to see, and I recommend it. You can go on Netflix and find “I am Jane Doe.”

Unfortunately, for those mothers and countless others, backpage has gotten away with this. It is not because people haven't tried to sue them, prosecutors haven't tried to go after them; it is because the courts have consistently said they are shielded from prosecution, they are shielded from these lawsuits. They are shielded by a Federal law, one we passed in this Chamber 21 years ago.

It is called the Communications Decency Act. It was a well-intended law. In 1996, the focus was, when the internet was in its infancy, trying to ensure there could be freedom of the internet.

Ironically, part of the original intention of the Communications Decency Act was to protect children from indecent material on the internet by letting websites remove and block some of that explicit material. Now that same law is being used as a shield by online sex traffickers who promote and engage in this with immunity. This Federal law is being used by websites to get away with something that would be illegal, criminal if they were to do it on the street corner.

Congress did not intend this broad immunity, but numerous courts across the country have made it clear their hands are tied because of the illegal precedents that have been set the way the courts have interpreted this law. As the lawmaking branch of the Federal Government, it is up to us to fix this injustice. No one else can do it.

One of the Federal courts said this cannot be fixed by litigation; it has to be fixed by legislation. That is why America's district attorneys, 50 of the State attorneys general in this country, judges all over the country, and many others have called on Congress to amend the Communications Decency Act and fix this injustice.

In one of the most direct calls for congressional action yet, in August of last year, a Sacramento judge cited the broad Communications Decency Act in dismissing pimping charges against backpage.com. The court opinion stated: "If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitation of others by human trafficking."

This judge issued an invitation to Congress to act. Others have as well. Websites that knowingly sell vulnerable women and children for sex are profiting and getting away with sex trafficking because of a Federal law. It is up to Congress to do the right thing, to fix this loophole. That is why my co-author, RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, who is on the floor this evening, and I introduced the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA, alongside a bipartisan group of four other original cosponsors: Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL, Senator JOHN CORNYN, and Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP. Soon, others joined us. In that first day, we had 24 cosponsors, bipartisan. Soon, we had a majority of Republicans and majority of Democrats cosponsoring this legislation. I want to thank those five original cosponsors because they helped us put together legislation that was targeted, focused, and actually fixes the problem.

SESTA will provide justice for victims of online sex trafficking and hold accountable the websites that knowingly facilitate these crimes by making two very narrowly focused changes to

Federal law. First, it allows victims to get the justice they deserve by removing the Communications Decency Act's broad liability protections for a narrow set of bad actors, specifically for websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking crimes. Second, it will allow State prosecutors and State attorneys general to prosecute these websites that violate Federal trafficking laws.

SESTA says if you are violating sex trafficking laws and you are doing it knowingly, you are facilitating it, then you have to be held to account. That is common sense. This bill includes legislation from the House side that creates new criminal penalties. It creates a new Federal crime for websites that have the intent to promote or facilitate illegal prostitution.

All of these changes will help to hold bad actors accountable while doing nothing to impair the free internet. In fact, SESTA will protect websites that do not actively and knowingly engage in online sex trafficking. We do that by preserving the Communications Decency Act's Good Samaritan provision, which protects good actors who proactively block, and screen for, offensive material, thus shielding them from frivolous lawsuits.

SESTA's fair, commonsense approach is why this bill has an extraordinary coalition of support. National law enforcement organizations, including the Fraternal Order of Police, faith-based groups, the civil rights community, major businesses, even including a number of tech companies, support this legislation. Most importantly, anti-trafficking advocates and trafficking survivors are the ones who support SESTA. They are the ones we listened to when we drafted this legislation. They are the folks back in Ohio, back in Connecticut—back in our States—who came to us and talked to us about this issue. They are the ones we not just listened to but actually worked with to help draft something that would work to close this loophole.

This bill makes all the sense in the world, and it will do its part in helping to close this gap, in helping to deal, in this century, in this country with the amazing ability that people have to exploit someone online criminally and not be held liable.

I thank Leader MITCH MCCONNELL for his leadership, for his commitment to combat sex trafficking, and for putting this bill on the floor for a vote.

I thank Senator JOHN THUNE, who chairs the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, and BILL NELSON, who is the ranking member. They held a hearing on this bill and marked it up, and it addressed some of the concerns that had been expressed by the tech community.

Here in the Senate, we now have over 60 cosponsors. This has not been an issue of politics or partisanship. It has been an issue of the heart. It is about preventing exploitation. It is about providing justice. There are some in

this Chamber who will want to change this legislation over the next couple of days as we debate it.

I have a great deal of respect for my colleague from Oregon, Senator RON WYDEN. I talked about him last night on the floor. I talked about the work he has done to combat human trafficking. I talked about the legislation I did with him to provide better data for sex trafficking, which was his legislation. He was also a leader in passing the Communications Decency Act, which we are amending through this legislation. I understand he is passionate about that bill that passed 21 years ago.

We took a very targeted approach here, which is why the Internet Association, which represents much of the tech community—not all but much of it—actually endorses our efforts. This is the Senate's immediate opportunity to help stop online sex trafficking while protecting a free and open internet. It is the right balance. It has already passed the House of Representatives. The White House has shown a commitment to it and is willing to sign the legislation. Now it is the Senate's turn to act.

So let me tell you where I stand. I stand with law enforcement officials all around the country and with prosecutors all around the country who have asked us to pass this legislation to give them the tools they need to stop this exploitation. I stand with Kubiiki Pride, whom I talked about earlier, Nacole S., Yvonne Ambrose, and the mothers across the country who have had their children exploited at the hands of online sex traffickers. I stand with the young women and children I have met in Dayton and Columbus and Akron and Toledo and Cincinnati and Cleveland—all over Ohio—who are sex trafficking survivors, who are victims who want justice.

I know that, together, we will all stand on the right side of history when the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act is voted on, has passed this Chamber, and eventually becomes law so as to immediately help provide justice for these victims. Justice cannot be seen, but its absence is felt. Those who have been trafficked online, who see the websites that have knowingly facilitated in this prosper and escape legal consequences, are the ones who have experienced real injustice. They have felt that injustice. We can right this wrong. Let's pass the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act to provide these victims the justice they deserve.

I notice again, as I mentioned earlier, the coauthor of this legislation—my colleague—is on the floor. He is a former Federal prosecutor. He has dealt with these issues both as a prosecutor and as a legislator. We are the cochairs and cofounders of the Caucus to End Human Trafficking, which we started 6 or 7 years ago. I thank him for his work on this important legislation.

I yield my time to Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, at the very start, I am grateful, and I praise my cosponsor, Senator PORTMAN, who has helped to lead in the championing of this measure. He has really been steadfast in the face of a lot of challenges. It was a difficult bill to draft and then to redraft and change again in response to suggestions that we received from friends and adversaries, but Senator PORTMAN has been really stalwart throughout it.

I join him in thanking our partners, Senator MCCASKILL, Senator MCCAIN, Senator HEITKAMP, Senator CORNYN, and, of course, Senator THUNE, who is the chairman of the committee, and Ranking Member NELSON.

This road began for me more than 10 years ago when I was the State attorney general in Connecticut, and I wanted to pursue legal remedies against the websites. Back then, it was Craigslist or MySpace that promoted sex trafficking and prostitution as well as pornography. My staff informed me that there was a provision of Federal law—section 230 of the Communications Decency Act—that would stop me in my tracks. Indeed, it has stopped others, most recently some of the survivors of sex trafficking who were told by a Federal court of appeals, in effect, that what happened to you is outrageous, and there should be a remedy for you, but section 230 of the Communications Decency Act blocks your day in court. It closes the courthouse doors to you in your seeking a legal remedy.

Along the way, there were many who said to Senator PORTMAN and to me that we could never pass this legislation because it would hold trafficking websites accountable. They said the opponents of this change were too powerful, too big, too entrenched. They said the victims and survivors were too powerless, too invisible.

We have met them. We know their stories. They are heartbreaking. They are children—some younger than the pages in this Chamber today—who have endured torture that is unspeakable and unthinkable for anyone of any age, and they deserve their day in court, rights, and remedies—real remedies that make the rights real.

So I thank Senator PORTMAN, and I thank, as he has also done, those survivors who have come forward and been the faces and voices of our cause. Their courage and strength and that of their family members have enabled us to reach this point.

I emphasize that this measure is very carefully and narrowly written to address a specific harm, and I want to take a couple of minutes to correct any misunderstanding that there may be in this Chamber.

First, some of the legislation's critics have claimed it will impose liability on the so-called Good Samaritan. In reality, this bill explicitly preserves subsection 230(c)(2)(A) of the Communications Decency Act, commonly called

the Good Samaritan provision. This provision ensures that websites cannot be held liable on account of actions taken in good faith to restrict objectionable material. SESTA is crystal clear on this point. A website operator's good deeds cannot be used against him.

This measure is also technology neutral. It imposes no requirement that website operators use a particular technology to screen their sites for objectionable content. They are free to use whatever technology they wish. That is why the Internet Association and its member companies support this legislation. They know that if technology companies work to prevent human trafficking and not to profit from it, they have nothing to fear from this measure.

I understand that an amendment has been offered to restate SESTA's Good Samaritan provision. Even if the amendment only protected Good Samaritans, it would be unnecessary and potentially confusing to the courts. I emphasize that point. It would obfuscate and confuse the good intent of the Good Samaritan provision. It would also derail this widely popular legislation by sending it back to the House, where special interests will have another chance to kill it. Unfortunately, this proposed amendment—perhaps unintentionally—would not simply protect Good Samaritans; it would also protect websites that operate in bad faith. It would also protect websites that identify sex trafficking ads and then leave them up in order to continue profiting from them.

I will briefly talk about one other amendment that has been offered—again, while being well-intentioned—that threatens to derail this legislation.

The amendment would provide additional money to Attorney General Sessions to investigate and prosecute websites that criminally facilitate human trafficking. I believe law enforcement ought to have additional resources. I firmly support more funding to investigate and prosecute this criminal activity, but this bill is not the means by which to do it.

In fact, law enforcement and the community against human trafficking are strongly against these amendments. Let me repeat. These law enforcement groups include the Fraternal Order of Police, the Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies, the FBI Agents Association, and I could go down the list. In fact, there is no need to.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters from these groups be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MCCONNELL AND SCHUMER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 1865, the "Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act," which includes language from S. 1693, the "Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act," which the FOP also supports.

This legislation will allow law enforcement to investigate and prosecute individuals and businesses that advertise or facilitate sex trafficking more effectively. The bill will create a new Federal offense prohibiting the use or operation of an in-state facility, like a website, that promotes or facilitates illegal prostitution.

The FOP is opposed to the two pending amendments because they may have the unintended consequence of derailing this important legislation. Amendments to this bill will only continue to deprive the survivors and victims of sex trafficking of getting justice.

On behalf of the more than 335,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we urge you both to pass this legislation without any amendments on the Senate floor. If we can be of any additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Senior Advisor, Jim Pasco, in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

MARCH 19, 2018.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Democratic Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER SCHUMER: We, the undersigned organizations, representing prosecutors, chiefs of police, sheriffs, rank and file officers and chief executives of state investigative agencies at the federal, state, and local level, write to urge a clean vote this week in the Senate on the House-passed FOSTA/SESTA package so that victims and federal and state law enforcement can better seek to hold all responsible parties accountable for the facilitation of sex trafficking. At the same time, we urge you to reject the proposed amendment that would create a shield for companies vaguely attempting to filter content on their websites and the proposed amendment that would provide additional funding through the Department of Justice to investigate and prosecute website operators that criminally facilitate sex trafficking. Simply put, the amendment to create a liability shield is bad public policy and the funding amendment is a poison pill that is dead on arrival if sent back to the House.

As membership organizations charged with protecting our communities, we can't afford to sacrifice the opportunity to pass good public policy to hold facilitators of sex trafficking accountable. Through extensive discussions over the past couple of years, a delicate balance has been struck among a wide variety of stakeholders to achieve the legislation pending before the Senate. The House passed version, which included language from the Senate SESTA version, was a carefully crafted piece of legislation to help state and local law enforcement bring more of these sex trafficking cases forward and we

encourage you to provide us with the tools needed to achieve that goal.

Sincerely,

Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies;

FBI Agents Association;

Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association;

International Association of Chiefs of Police;

Major Cities Chiefs Association;

Major County Sheriffs of America;

National Association of Police Organizations;

National District Attorneys Association;

National Fusion Center Association;

National Sheriffs' Association.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, my colleagues should take heed of what these groups are saying because they see through the potentially derailing impact of these amendments.

I close by again thanking my friend and partner, Senator PORTMAN, as well as Senator MCCASKILL, Senator HEITKAMP, Senator CORNYN, and Senator MCCAIN.

This measure is truly bipartisan, as it should be. There is nothing partisan about sex trafficking. There is nothing excusable or tolerable about it. I hope the Senate will do its job tomorrow and send this legislation to the President's desk.

I yield the floor to my partner, Senator PORTMAN, with my thanks.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I know there are other Members who are interested in speaking.

Let me just say, Senator BLUMENTHAL's role as a prosecutor has informed him; therefore, the legislation is better for it.

We just heard what Senator BLUMENTHAL said. He understands this bill inside and out and the fact that there are well-meaning amendments that are being offered that would derail this legislation, which is something we want to avoid. We want to get this to the President's desk for his signature and begin to save people.

I notice my other colleague, Senator MCCASKILL, whom I mentioned earlier a couple of times, is on the floor. She was the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee that investigated this issue of looking at the websites and that came up with not just how it was happening and why it was happening but a legislative response.

I yield a few minutes to Senator MCCASKILL.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I thank Senator PORTMAN, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and my other colleagues for allowing me to jump in here for a couple of minutes.

This body—this entire body—is really responsible for where we are right now because it was during the investigation package that we realized that section 230 was being used as a shield for the bad guys. All of the attorneys general around the country and various law enforcement agencies and individuals who were trying to sue backpage were met every time with a 230 defense. They were not even able to penetrate

to get the documents from backpage in order to learn about what backpage was really up to. It was an investigation by which backpage thought it would be able to win again in court and deny us our opportunity to look at the documents and to look at the underlying evidence that one should always look at in an investigation.

Frankly, our getting the contempt-of-the-Senate resolution through this body almost unanimously—I think it was unanimously, wasn't it, I ask Senator PORTMAN?

Mr. PORTMAN. Yes.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. And then our going all the way to the Supreme Court and winning was finally the first time backpage had to turn over the dirty evidence of its knowingly facilitating sex trafficking on its page. That is why this language is “knowingly facilitate”—just to make sure that in going forward, no bad guys can hide behind section 230.

The other part of this bill that, I think, is very important and that, I think, a lot of people forget—and with all due respect to my friends who are in this Chamber who were U.S. attorneys—is that over 90 percent of the crime that is prosecuted in this country is prosecuted by local prosecutors, State prosecutors, who are called prosecutors or district attorneys, depending on the State's term that is used. They have been handcuffed in terms of being able to bring these kinds of cases. This legislation not only opens up the courthouse doors to victims who have been victimized by this but also so that the full force of American law enforcement can be brought to bear on this problem, not just the limited jurisdiction that was available around the problem of sex trafficking.

This is so important to getting to the bottom of it because many U.S. attorneys don't have the time, and, frankly, many attorneys general don't have the time or the jurisdiction to get after crime, but the local prosecutors don't get to decide which cases to go after. If there is a 9-1-1 call, they have it. The Feds can come in later and say: We have it, and we are going to take it. But they are the ones who day after day are in the trenches of sex crimes, and they are the ones who now have the ability to go after these cases in a way that will be very meaningful.

I am proud of the bipartisan nature of this. I am proud of the partnership we have, Senator PORTMAN, on the Subcommittee on Investigations. I know we will get a big vote on this. I think people see through these amendments as ways to slow this bill down or possibly kill it, and I hope we will all can join together and take this to the finish line tomorrow.

I thank my colleagues for giving me a few minutes.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank Senator MCCASKILL, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and the other Members who came to speak. We will continue this dialogue tomorrow on the floor before passage.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank Senator PORTMAN and Senator BLUMENTHAL for their work on this. Senator PORTMAN and I have spent untold hours, and he has been a leader on this. I thank him for his leadership, in Toledo and Cincinnati, but especially in Toledo, where the sheriff, the community, Celia Williamson, and so many others have been so important in combating this terrible affliction in our society. I thank them.

WALL STREET AND AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. President, last week, the House passed another giveaway to Wall Street, siding with special interests and rolling back accountability on some of the biggest banks at the expense of taxpayers. It comes on the heels of last year's tax giveaway that will benefit those same megabanks. This Congress bends over backward to help Wall Street while working families continue to struggle.

It is not just that we are helping Wall Street with tax breaks, we are helping Wall Street with rolling back regulations. Let me outline what exactly all that means.

In a series over several months, I am laying out the case for how Wall Street undermines America's workers and some of the changes we need to make in this country to grow our middle class and make work pay off.

Remember, one of the points I made was that American Airlines announced that they were going to increase workers' wages, as did Chipotle, and Wall Street hit them with a lower stock price as a result.

In each installment of this series, we have talked about these issues. I want to talk specifically this time about what Wall Street's war on workers does to employment. You can follow each installment on my medium page at www.medium.com/@SenatorBrown.

Last time, I talked about workers' paychecks. Today, I want to talk about layoffs.

Wall Street's singular focus on padding their own pockets is bad enough, but worse, it comes at the direct expense of American workers. Corporations focus almost exclusively on their quarterly performance on the stock market. That is how a CEO's performance is evaluated. They are compensated in large part with company shares. They do better when their stock price goes up. They do things to make their stock price go up, and then they do even better because they are compensated in large part with company shares.

Wall Street analysts like it when corporations minimize their cost to boost their short-term profits; hence the stock price goes up even when the company is already profitable, and that leads directly to layoffs. Corporations lay off workers to show they are serious about cutting expenses, and their stock prices often rise as a result. Wall

Street's war on workers means not only smaller paychecks but also pink slips for those workers.

How did we get to a point where stock prices are more important than workers? It didn't happen overnight.

I was talking with Senator WHITEHOUSE about this, and whether it is Cranston, RI, or Mansfield, OH, companies used to consider their employees, their customers, and even the people in the town they did business in, as stakeholders. They cared about their community, they cared about their workers, and they cared about their customers. They felt a duty to fulfill obligations to a broader community, not just their own corporate board members and their own corporate executives.

I grew up in Mansfield, OH, a city of about 50,000 in North Central Ohio halfway between our State's two largest cities, Cleveland and Columbus. I remember that there were so many companies in our town. I didn't know those company presidents—they were the big people in town, and I was a kid—but I do remember what those companies did. They sponsored Little League teams. They were involved in local Kiwanis clubs. They cared about workers, and they cared about the community. They cared about their customers. They weren't always interested in shareholders; they were interested in stakeholders, in all of us as a community. All the workers, all the customers, and all of the community were stakeholders. But now the focus has narrowed to just shareholders.

As Wall Street's influence has grown, corporate priorities have shifted from shareholders kind of writ large, and the way success is measured has changed fundamentally to stockholders. Businesses have become beholden to those quarterly earnings reports. They have left employees, communities, and customers behind in many ways. They do everything possible, including laying off workers, to make sure their balance sheets and profit margins look as good as they can—the impact on the workers and the long-term health of the company be damned.

In the 1980s, investors began to pursue hostile takeovers of companies that failed to maximize profits. Executives at other companies began to fear takeovers if they didn't keep profits and stock prices high. The pay packages of top management became greater and greater and became more and more closely tied to short-term stock performance.

Wall Street's and Main Street's interests began to diverge. Folks in the corporate boardroom were no longer forced to consider what was in the long-term interests of their workers and of their small-time investors. For top corporate executives, workers became nothing more than a line item in the budget, a cost to be minimized.

By the 1990s, even profitable companies started laying off workers to boost profits even further. Look at what hap-

pened to Xerox, an iconic American company that had never had a major layoff in its history. In 1993, the company announced plans to cut 10,000 workers despite being profitable. The company was doing fine. It wasn't a case of an industry moving south, facing an agonizing decision with bad options, but the CEO justified the job cuts as necessary “to compete effectively” and to have a “lean and flexible organization.” He also said he expected to see higher profits because of the layoffs the following year.

Xerox wasn't alone. In the first 10 months of 1998, when the economy was booming, corporations laid off over half a million U.S. workers—200,000 more than were laid off the year before. This is the definition of profits before people, and things have gotten worse and worse since the late 1990s.

In 2015, Sysco announced a 3-year plan that included reducing its workforce—corporate-speak for laying off workers. It might have made sense if the company had experienced a year of sluggish sales, but guess what—the opposite was true. Their sales had increased. They generated \$1 billion in cash flow, and they were able to pay \$700 million in dividends to the company shareholders. If the large dividend payout the year before wasn't generous enough, the CEO said that one of the goals of the 3-year plan and its layoffs was to “maximize shareholder returns”—not stakeholders, not employees, not the communities, not the customers, but shareholder returns.

The next year, 2016, Tyson Foods announced layoffs despite having a good quarter in beef sales. The following year, the company's president touted “exceptional financial results.” What was the reason for those results? Cost-cutting. It is always cost-cutting—more corporate-speak for laying off workers. Do you know what else he cited as the company's good health? Not great sales, not new products or investments in more workers, but the ability of the company to buy back billions of dollars of its own stock. So an accounting trick that funnels money to executives is what the company cited as a measure of its success. Buying back means executive compensation goes up. That is the key to what it was doing with cost-cutting. The company buys up shares of its own stock to drive up the price and increase the value for shareholders and the compensation for executives whose pay is tied to stock performance. Sounds familiar.

It is no coincidence that since the biggest corporations reaped their tax windfalls in September, they have announced billions of dollars in buybacks. It is always about the executives—about the executives' tax cuts, about the executives' compensation, about the executives' buybacks. Again and again, we see Wall Street consider workers as simply a cost to be cut but executive pay as essential to a company.

Last year, Humana announced that it was eliminating 2,700 jobs despite \$13

billion in revenue. In the same call that the CEO announced the layoffs, he also announced an increase in executive pay. Workers lose their jobs to pay for more money for corporate executives. Sound familiar again and again and again? And the cherry on top? A month later, Humana announced \$3 billion in stock buybacks. Again, what is that about? Higher executive compensation.

Of course, cost-cutting measures typically include workers losing their jobs. Cost-cutting measures almost never include pay cuts for corporate executives. In each of these examples, the company cited cost cuts that were so necessary, they had to fire workers, upend thousands of employees. I wonder how many of those executives and how many of those corporate leaders actually brought some of those workers into their offices and looked them in the eye and told them they were laying them off. My guess is that they had a much lower paid employee make that announcement and face the media and, more importantly, face the employees who lost their jobs.

How many of these executives actually listened to the story of an employee who loses her job, loses her house, whose total life is upended? How many of them ever listened to the stories of what happened to their workers who got fired? The company cited cost cuts that were so necessary, they had to fire those workers.

The shortsighted approach to running a company may work for top executives who can squeeze as much value out of the company in the short term without considering the business's long-term value. It is not just bad for the employees and communities, it is usually bad for the long-term health of the company. Making short-term decisions pays off if you are already well paid, but it doesn't work for those employees. Mainstream investors and workers only make a profit when a company's stock value continues to rise over time, but the corporate executives are no longer forced to consider what is in the long-term interest of workers and small-time investors. As long as Wall Street's analysis of one-size-fits-all measure of corporate success continues to be cost-cutting, workers are at constant risk of losing their jobs. As long as CEOs get paid based on stock prices instead of the company's long-term success, workers will keep getting fired from hostile companies.

We need to break this cycle of greed between Wall Street and CEOs. In the end, companies can't be profitable without good workers. We need policies that restructure our economy so workers share in the profits they create and Wall Street doesn't determine when workers keep their jobs or how much is in their paycheck.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, we are more aware than ever of the accelerating pace of climate change and of the serious threat that rising seas, higher temperatures, and changing weather poses. I suppose I don't need to lecture the Presiding Officer from Florida on the threat of rising seas.

The real-time effects of climate change are becoming clearer and clearer every year. Here is a telling example unfolding right now in the Arctic.

In this graphic, we see the mean area of Arctic sea ice over the last several decades. The maximum yearly extent of the ice, which occurs around this time of year, continues to shrink each decade.

This line tracks the sea ice in the Arctic in millions of square kilometers, running from February through to May. This is the track of the sea ice extent during the 1980s. If you take all the years in the 1980s and you average them together and you run through the calendar, it is like a clock going this way through these months. You would see the sea ice growing and fading away as spring came to the Arctic.

That is where the ice was when averaging the 1980s. This green line is the exact same thing; it is just for the 1990s. So we can see how much sea ice has been lost averaged decade over decade.

The blue line here is for 2000. Once again, we see a loss of sea ice—a considerable loss from the levels back as recently as the 1980s.

The purple line right here is the average of the years in this decade so far, from 2010 to 2017—that is the average of those 7 years. This dot is the high, the maximum ice extent recorded in 2016. This lower dot is the lower high of the ice recorded in 2017. So you can see that even though this is the average, the trend remains downward.

This red line is what we have measured so far in 2018. Here we are right now in March of 2018, and it is well below. Decade after decade, we see the ice melting away.

As these facts and so many others relentlessly pile up, it has become harder and harder for the fossil fuel industry and the web of front groups and the Trump administration officials who do its bidding to claim that there is nothing to see here: Folks, move along; it is all just a big hoax.

The University of Alaska is our closest university to the Arctic. The University of Alaska actually has a climate science center where they are studying and teaching the science of climate change. The University of Alaska also actually has the Ocean Acidification Research Center. As I have pointed out in these speeches over the years, one of the most obvious and pernicious consequences of climate change is that when you ramp the CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere, the oceans, which cover 70 percent of the surface of the world, absorb not only

excess heat, but they actually chemically absorb the carbon dioxide. When that happens, they become more acidic. In the wee hours of a morning months and months ago, I actually did the experiment right here, where I blew the carbon dioxide from my breath through an aquarium bubbler into a glass of water that had pH-sensitive dye in it, and you could see, in the moment that it took for me to exhale that carbon-dioxide-rich breath through the water, how the color changed, and you could measure it against the color chart for pH and see how just that one breath changed the acidity of the water and made it more acid.

That is happening across the planet, and it affects creatures like terrapods, which are a very important species for salmon, which is, in turn, a very important industry for Alaska. That is why Alaska has the Ocean Acidification Research Center—some hoax.

For this, my 201st “Time to Wake Up” speech, I wish to get into some of the reasons why I remain optimistic even in the face of relentless attacks on the environment, both from the fossil fuel industry and from the Trump administration. There are success stories, including bipartisan wins in Congress and major advances outside of Congress. We are still making progress on climate and energy policy, even under political siege by the fossil fuel industry.

First, there is an explosion in renewable energy. In 2017, renewables provided nearly 20 percent of electricity generation in the United States. Wind and solar energy costs fell, and utilities across the country, even in red States, invested heavily. The renewable energy industry in America hit 3.3 million jobs—more than all fossil fuel jobs combined. The private sector is leading renewables purchases. One example is AT&T. AT&T recently signed onto the World Wildlife Fund's Corporate Renewable Energy Buyers' Principles, a criteria to help energy producers meet the needs of large customers like AT&T. As part of that commitment with the World Wildlife Fund, AT&T has signed two agreements with NextEra Energy for wind power—220 megawatts from an Oklahoma wind farm and 300 megawatts from a Texas wind farm. It is one of the largest corporate renewable energy purchases in history. I congratulate my Texas and Oklahoma colleagues for these new, home-State, renewable energy jobs, and I congratulate AT&T for its foresight and leadership.

Another business breakthrough came when the massive asset manager BlackRock helped break Exxon's and Occidental Petroleum's resistance and forced through shareholder resolutions requiring those oil producers to report their climate risk to their shareholders, to their investors. I, for one, don't think those shareholders are yet getting the full story.

The multinational insurance firm, AXA, announced that it would divest

from its tar sands holdings and it would stop providing insurance for pipelines that transport tar sands oil.

Credit rating agency Moody's announced that it will consider climate risk in rating coastal communities' municipal bonds. So our coastal municipalities in Rhode Island, the Presiding Officer's coastal communities in Florida, and coastal communities across the country are now going to have to take into account the climate risk, what infrastructure and what hazards they face from sea level rise and increased storm activity, and all of the things we associate with climate change. It is going to be part of how the rating agencies value their municipal bonds. That is going to change behavior, and it doesn't matter whether you are a red State or a blue State.

Companies like Microsoft and Unilever have baked into their own internal accounting their own internal carbon prices to help them reduce the carbon intensity of their operations. And, of course, virtually every Republican who has thought the climate change problem through to a solution has come to a price on carbon as being the market-based solution to that problem.

When the President announced that he would withdraw the United States from the historic Paris Agreement, leaving us as the pariah nation—the only one in the world to reject this global pledge—many American companies pledged that, as to that Paris Agreement, they are still in.

The corruption of the Trump administration by fossil fuel interests has not affected many State and local officials. In Colorado, for instance, the Colorado State Public Utility Commission is working with Xcel Energy to build out a cleaner energy mix and retire older fossil fuel units. Specifically, Colorado is looking to retire 660 megawatts of coal-fired generation—close it down—and replace it with renewables. Their recent request for bids brought a flood of new renewable energy proposals at costs that came in beating out existing coal and natural gas facilities. New-built renewables on price beat out existing fossil fuel. The market is speaking, and it is saying that fossil fuel, even with all its scandalous and well-defended subsidies, can't compete. Fossil can't compete.

On the Paris Agreement, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Virginia, Washington State and—I am proud to say—Rhode Island all declared that they, too, are still in. They will meet their goals. Alaska announced that it would meet its Paris Agreement goals. What is more, California and Washington State have combined with Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico in a plan to put a price on carbon that would reach up and down virtually the entire Pacific coast of the Americas—from Canada all the way down through Chile.

One problem for the fossil fuel folks' political influence, which is so deadly

effective here in Congress, is that it doesn't do so well in government agencies where the rule of law, not politics, prevails. So the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, a Federal administrative agency bound by rule of law, more or less blew off a preposterous proposal by fossil fuel flunkies at the Department of Energy to subsidize coal even more. Instead, FERC recently finalized a rule for energy storage in America's electric grids. This will not only expand energy storage, but it will also accelerate renewables like wind and solar. A recent study predicted that the rule could spur—hold on—50,000 megawatts of additional energy storage across the United States, enough to power roughly 35 million homes. This estimate could turn out to be conservative, if renewables prices keep heading in their current trajectories. That FERC rule, by the way, was unanimous and bipartisan.

FERC oversees the system operators, like ISO-New England, which are steadily improving the role of renewables in regional markets, removing the obstacles that had kept renewables from competing fairly in capacity auctions and dispatch decisions. With wind power being such a large part of Iowa's energy mix, for example, its midwestern ISO figured out the algorithms to treat wind as reliable, baseload power. FERC's storage rule will give these system operators a new avenue for further progress on clean, renewable energy.

Believe it or not, even Congress has acted. Just last month, Congress passed a bipartisan budget agreement that included legislation I cosponsored with Senators HETTKAMP, CAPITO, and BARRASSO to spur investment and innovation in next-generation carbon capture, utilization, and storage technologies. Our bill attracted what I would call an unlikely coalition of energy, industrial, agricultural, and technology companies, as well as environment and labor groups.

This bill puts a positive price on carbon reduction through a tax credit for projects that capture and utilize or store carbon dioxide emissions. Without that price signal, there was little incentive to innovate how to turn carbon pollution from powerplants and industrial facilities into something safe or even useful. The bill even incentivizes technologies to pull carbon pollution directly from the atmosphere. The key is that Congress, for the first time, put a dollar value on reducing carbon pollution.

The Senate also just passed a nuclear innovation bill written by Senator CRAPO and me to increase collaboration between private industry, universities, and national laboratories in advanced nuclear technologies. Our bill was also cosponsored by Senators BOOKER, MURKOWSKI, RISCH, HATCH, and DURBIN. It would put private innovators together with our National Labs, with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and with the Energy De-

partment—all working together on safe, new nuclear technologies.

My goal here is not only to help bring new carbon-free technologies forward, ultimately to a carbon-free power grid, but also to explore technologies that just may allow us to turn our present hazardous nuclear waste stockpiles to productive use—to generate clean energy, to move those waste stockpiles from the liability to the asset column on our Nation's books. What an achievement that would be.

Although Congress may be blockaded still by fossil fuel interests, it is nevertheless the law of the land that administrative agencies must take into account the social cost of carbon—the cost that fossil fuels carbon pollution imposes on society—in making energy-related decisions. That test will remain, and lawsuits are slowly closing in on the moment of discovery, when lawyers finally get access to the fossil fuel industry's files, and decades of lies, denial, and political manipulation are exposed for all to see.

The well-funded climate denial machine, with its front groups and trick-pony scientists and political muscle operation, can only keep the denial castle propped up for so long. But until that battlement of lies collapses—and it will—until it collapses, nevertheless, progress still continues all around us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are quickly turning to the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act legislation, coupled with the legislation that has come over from the House of Representatives, and I hope we will get a big bipartisan vote in support of that legislation when it is voted on, probably tomorrow.

Let me just say that for more than two decades, the commercial internet has been an undeniable force for good. It has delivered economic opportunity to people who would not otherwise have had it. It has empowered marginalized citizens around the world to fight back against oppressors. It has expanded educational opportunities and made news and information more accessible, and more. But like any tool, the internet can be used for evil as well as good, and right now, certain corners of the internet are being exploited to facilitate sex trafficking, including the widespread trafficking of children.

Each year, thousands of children are sexually trafficked within the United States. That is right. Thousands of children are trafficked each year in the United States—not in some faraway country but right here at home in our communities. More and more every day, this trafficking is being facilitated via the internet. Three out of four children who have been sexually trafficked in this country have been trafficked online.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children reported an 846-per-

cent increase in reports of suspected child sex trafficking from 2010 to 2015. The increase, the national center reports, is “directly correlated to the increased use of the internet to sell children for sex.”

Obviously, dedicated prosecutors and law enforcement around the country are working every day to combat the proliferation of sex trafficking on the internet, but some of their efforts have been stymied by a provision of a 1996 law called the Communications Decency Act. The provision in question—section 230—was meant to protect websites from being held accountable for material people create and post on their sites. It is thanks in part to this provision that such popular sites as Facebook, YouTube and Twitter have been able to flourish. But certain websites have used this provision to defend themselves in court cases dealing with criminal activity that they have knowingly allowed or participated in—specifically, sex trafficking.

Needless to say, Congress never intended this provision to be used to protect websites that knowingly and deliberately facilitate trafficking, but courts have generally held that this provision does not permit them to hold websites accountable for knowingly facilitating sex trafficking.

Courts have also made clear that if Congress wants to ensure that these trafficking accomplices can be prosecuted, it needs to provide some more clarity on this provision. That is what we are here to do today.

Senator ROB PORTMAN of Ohio has been a leading voice in the Senate in the fight against human trafficking, and the legislation before us today includes his legislation, the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, which will prevent section 230 from being used as a defense by those who are knowingly cooperating with sex traffickers. Under this Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, State law enforcement officials will be able to prosecute websites that knowingly assist in or facilitate sex trafficking, and victims will be allowed to sue websites that violate the Federal sex trafficking statute. State attorneys general will now also be allowed to file civil suits against websites that knowingly facilitate trafficking.

The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act is an outstanding bill and a great credit to Senator PORTMAN and the others he worked with to get it considered here on the Senate floor. It addresses a hole in our laws that is allowing sex traffickers to exploit the internet to facilitate their trafficking, but it ensures that only bad actors are targeted, and it maintains the key freedoms that have allowed the internet to flourish. Under this legislation, websites can only be prosecuted if they knowingly facilitate or support trafficking.

This bill is strongly supported by Members of both parties. In fact, 67 out of the 100 U.S. Senators are cosponsors of this bill. This bill is supported by

the White House. It is supported by law enforcement organizations. It is supported by organizations that fight sex trafficking. It is supported by faith-based organizations. It is also supported by a number of major technology companies. I was proud to help facilitate conversations with a number of technology companies that resulted in solid support for this bill among members of the technology community.

The process of getting this bill to the Senate floor today has been characterized by a wonderful degree of bipartisanship. I am hoping that continues as we debate this bill over the next couple of days, and I encourage my colleagues to reject any attempts to slow this bill down with amendments. We have a remarkable degree of consensus on the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, both within and without Congress, and we should not disturb this momentum. We need to get this bill over the finish line. Every day that we wait for this bill to be enacted into law is another day in which websites in the dark corners of the internet can facilitate the heinous practice of sexually exploiting vulnerable human beings.

During the Commerce Committee hearing that I chaired on this bill, we heard testimony from Yvonne Ambrose, whose daughter, Desiree Robinson, was sexually trafficked repeatedly before being murdered. Desiree was just 16, a bright and loving girl who dreamed of becoming a doctor in the Air Force. Instead, she was raped and murdered by a man twice her age who had sought her for sex after seeing her advertised on an internet site.

Every day across this country, there is another Desiree being trafficked. Some of these children are not yet teenagers. They should be going to basketball games and birthday parties. Instead, they are being taken to homes and hotels and being violated by strangers. Some, like Desiree, will die there.

Fighting trafficking has to be a priority for all of us.

I am proud to have helped draft two bills that became law earlier this year to address human trafficking in commercial vehicles. But while we have passed some good legislation over the past few years, there is a lot more work that needs to be done. There are many more Desirees out there in danger, and we have an obligation to do everything we can to protect them.

The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act will strike an important blow against this new wave of traffickers exploiting the internet to sell children, and the bill it is now part of, a bill that we are considering today—the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act—will further boost SESTA's impact by establishing new criminal penalties for facilitating sex trafficking.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and to get it to the President as soon as possible. There are a lot of children out there who are waiting for our help.

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.

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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 735, 736, 737, 738, and 739.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The bill clerk read the nominations of William M. McSwain, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years; Matthew D. Harris, of Utah, to be United States Marshal for the District of Utah for the term of four years; Johnny Lee Kuhlman, of Oklahoma, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Oklahoma for the term of four years; Joseph D. McClain, of Indiana, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Indiana for the term of four years; and David A. Weaver, of Colorado, to be United States Marshal for the District of Colorado 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. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the McSwain, Harris, Kuhlman, McClain, and Weaver nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a pe-

riod of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this week I joined my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, in introducing the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. This bill would update and reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs, which have provided lifesaving services and housing for America's homeless youth for more than 40 years.

Homelessness is affecting youth in unprecedented numbers. According to a recent study by Voices of Youth Count, an initiative of Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago, approximately 4.2 million young people experience homelessness in the United States each year. Some of these youth may stay away from home for only 1 or 2 nights, and others have been living on the streets for years. Approximately 73 percent experienced a homelessness episode lasting more than 1 month. The study also found that homelessness is as prevalent in rural communities as it is in urban communities.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act would reauthorize and strengthen the programs that help homeless youth meet their immediate needs, and secure long-term residential services for those who, sadly, cannot be safely reunified with family. Three programs—the Basic Center Program, Transitional Living Program, and Street Outreach Program—help community-based organizations reach these young people when they need the most support. These programs help runaway and homeless youth avoid the juvenile justice system, and early intervention helps these young people escape victimization.

As chairman of the Senate Housing Appropriations Subcommittee, working to end the scourge of homelessness—in both youth and adults—has been one of my top priorities. According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness, there has been a 27-percent drop in chronic homelessness since 2007. We must build on this success so that homeless youth have opportunities to succeed just as other youth. This bill is an important step in that direction.

The RHYA programs have produced powerful success stories. In 2015, the Housing Appropriations subcommittee held a hearing during which Brittany Dixon, a former homeless youth from Auburn, ME, testified about her personal experience as a homeless youth. After becoming homeless at age 18, she connected with New Beginnings, a service provider in Lewiston, ME, where

she received the help and support she needed to develop critical life skills and become self-sufficient. She went on to earn a college degree and obtain a full-time job as an education technician at an elementary school.

New Beginnings has used RHYA resources to connect with youth who need food, a safe place to sleep, health services, and education support. More than 135 young people were served at its 24-hour youth shelter in 2016, where they gained the support to return home safely, find independent living options, and deal with trauma, substance abuse, and mental health challenges. The Street Outreach Program, which would be reauthorized by our legislation, allows New Beginnings to operate an outreach drop-in center that reaches more than 500 youth annually.

Staff at Preble Street, a youth shelter in Portland, leveraged a grant from the Transitional Living Program, also reauthorized by our bill, to support First Place, a program that helps young people break out of homelessness and plan for independent living. They work with local landlords to secure affordable apartments for youth who cannot safely reunite with their families and help them develop the life skills they will need to achieve their goals.

For more than 25 years, Shaw House, in Bangor, has served Maine youth living in five rural counties. The Basic Center Program, BCP, reauthorized in our bill, helps Shaw House offer food, clothing, and other basic needs assistance, with the goal of increasing family reunification and reducing youth homelessness across Maine. In fiscal year 2014, 94 percent of the minors who entered BCP exited these programs safely and appropriately, and 69 percent were reunited with their families. One of the improvements in our bill would allow BCP grantees to serve youth for up to 30 days, instead of the current 21 days.

Teens run away and become homeless for many reasons. They are also at high risk of victimization, abuse, criminal activity, and death. The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children estimates that, in 2017, 1 in 7 of nearly 25,000 youth reported to them as runaways were sex-trafficking victims. In Maine, recent reports show that, of the more than 10,000 reported human-trafficking cases last year, 26 percent involved minors. Several hundreds of these victims identified as runaway or homeless youth. This population is at greater risk of suicide, unintended pregnancy, and substance abuse. Many are unable to continue with school and are more likely to enter our juvenile justice system.

Our bill focuses on this tragic problem by supporting trauma-informed, wraparound services for victims of trafficking and sexual exploitation. Congress has passed legislation in recent years to combat these horrific crimes and support survivors, and the policies and tools included in the Runaway and

Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act are important pieces of the Federal response to human trafficking.

Homeless young people need access to safe beds at night and oftentimes services during the day. A growing number of homeless youth identify as LGBT. According to the Voices of Youth Count report, LGBT young people are twice as likely to be homeless. Our bill would ensure that those seeking services through these Federal programs are not denied assistance based on their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act will support those young people who run away, are thrown out, or are disconnected from families. A caring and safe place to sleep, eat, grow, and develop is critical for all young people, and the programs reauthorized through this legislation help extend those basic services to the most vulnerable youth in our communities.

I thank Senator LEAHY for his leadership on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

NATIONAL STOP THE BLEED DAY

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I would like to speak today about National Stop the Bleed Day.

Our country will recognize National Stop the Bleed Day on March 31, 2018. Stop the Bleed is a program offered by the American College of Surgeons to help educate the general public on techniques to assist victims suffering from uncontrolled bleeding using direct pressure, gauze and bandages, and tourniquets.

Each year, more than 180,000 people die from traumatic injuries sustained as a result of events including vehicle crashes, falls, industrial and farm accidents, shootings, and natural disasters. The most common preventable cause of these deaths is losing too much blood in the minutes before trained responders arrive. Just like CPR training, a civilian familiar with basic bleeding control techniques is better equipped to save a life. The effort to make this training available to the public is driven by the goal to reduce or eliminate preventable death from bleeding.

I urge my colleagues to join me and rise in support of National Stop the Bleed Day and help to end the loss of life from uncontrolled bleeding by getting trained to "Stop the Bleed."

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS M. CONWAY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of a World War II hero: Lt. Rev. Thomas M. Conway, born April 5, 1908, in Waterbury, CT. Father Conway, who was born 110 years ago next month, was an American hero who, after the sinking of the USS *Indianapolis*, went from lifeboat to lifeboat in shark-infested

waters to care for his fellow sailors in a manner far above the call of duty.

The courage of the brave men who served on the USS *Indianapolis*, who delivered critical parts to the first atomic bomb used in combat, helped bring about the end of World War II. After their mission was complete, they were intercepted on their way to join with the rest of the Pacific fleet for the invasion of mainland Japan. Two torpedoes from a Japanese submarine struck the *Indianapolis* on July 30, 1945, sinking the battleship and immediately killing 300 of the 1,196 sailors aboard. The remaining 900 sailors were left to fend for their lives in the shark-infested Pacific, spending 3 days with few lifeboats or supplies and no way to notify the Navy of their peril.

Father Conway, as chaplain, disregarded his own safety by swimming back and forth among the men, administering aid, helping to gather those who had drifted from the mass of survivors, and continuing to minister and organize group prayers. His heroism gave comfort to the dying and helped save the lives of the 321 sailors who were rescued from the sea. Father Conway's acts of bravery took a physical toll, and he succumbed to the elements shortly before rescuers arrived. As one surviving sailor said of Father Conway, "He was the most visible person keeping the men together, giving them hope and sacrificing himself to keep his fellow sailors united, calm, and alert."

The legacy of Father Conway continues to inspire his family, fellow sailors, and the people of Connecticut. That is why next month, in recognition of his birthday, we pause to reflect upon and celebrate his courageous actions. His selflessness and bravery are the epitome of an American hero.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL CHARCILLEA "CHARCY" SCHAEFER

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to LTC Charcillea "Charcy" Schaefer for her exemplary dedication to duty and service as an Army congressional fellow and congressional budget liaison for the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller. Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer is transitioning from her present assignment to serve as a battalion commander for the 19th Military Police Battalion of the 25th Infantry Division, Schofield Barracks, HI.

Born in Ipswich, England, into an Air Force family, Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer was commissioned as a military police officer after her graduation from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point with a bachelor of science degree. She then went on to earn a master's degree in administration with a focus in leadership from Central Michigan University and another in legislative affairs from the George Washington University.

Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer has served in a broad range of assignments during her 15-year Army career. Her assignments took her across the country including Fort Bliss, TX; Fort Leonard Wood, MO; Fort Bragg, NC; and Fort Campbell, KY. She has four combat deployments encompassing over 45 months in theater, with 23 months advising host nation forces in policing and Army tactics and operations. Three of Charcy's deployments were to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and the fourth was to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

I had the privilege of working with Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer in my office in 2016 during her year as an Army congressional fellow, as well as during her subsequent assignment as a congressional budget liaison for the U.S. Army. Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer worked tirelessly with Members of Congress and their staff to accurately articulate the Army's budget positions to the Appropriations Committees. Her professionalism, diligence, and commitment to the mission are unmatched, and her work both as a fellow and as a liaison exemplify the best of the U.S. Army and the Department of Defense to the U.S. Congress.

The foundation of Charcy's military success is her family. Her parents, Parks and Mary Schaefer of New Bern, NC, provided the base of selfless service evident in all that she and her siblings, Chas and MaryLynne, do. Charcy is a devoted wife to Rachel Brant, an accomplished attorney and herself a captain in the U.S. Army Reserve Judge Advocate Corps. Rachel anxiously awaits their family's reunion, to include dogs Rocco and Stevie, in Honolulu. Their attitude of service and care for others permeates in each organization and activity they participate in, and they are both truly examples of extraordinary leaders in the Army and the communities they serve.

Throughout her career, Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer has positively impacted the soldiers, peers, and superiors around her. Our country has benefited tremendously from her extraordinary leadership, judgment, and passion. I join my colleagues today in honoring her dedication to our Nation and invaluable service to the U.S. Congress as an Army congressional liaison.

It has been a genuine pleasure to have worked with Lieutenant Colonel Schaefer over the last 2½ years. On behalf of a grateful nation, I proudly recognize and commend Charcy for her service to our country and wish her all the best as she continues her service in the U.S. Army.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONOR FLIGHT NORTHERN COLORADO'S 20TH FLIGHT TO DC

• Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I wish today to recognize the veterans of

Honor Flight Northern Colorado who have made their 20th trip to Washington, DC, to visit memorials that stand in their honor. This group consists of veterans from various wars and generations, but all are linked by their service to our country.

Founded in 2005, the Honor Flight program was originally formed to honor veterans that had served in World War II. The program has expanded and now welcomes veterans from across the country to fly to Washington, DC, free of charge, so that they can visit the national memorials dedicated to their service. These veterans have preserved our rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Few words sufficiently express the gratitude and respect we all have for these brave men and women. Of the 123 veterans on the most recent Honor Flight, 9 served in World War II, 25 served in Korea, and 89 served in Vietnam.

Please join me in honoring Carl Curtis, Eugene Doty, Ben Gutfelder, Fred Heinze, James Ingram, Elwood Johnsen, George Kunz, Stuart Mundt, Merwin Waterman, John Anderson, Ralph Ashton, William Bohn, Gerald Briggs, Joseph Carney, Dale Doty, Ernest Garcia, Charles Gustafson, Fred Hagen, Richard Hornung, Phillip Kaspar, Dixon King, George Lanes, John Lark, Don Moritz, August Roemer, Melvin Salter, Paul Salvador, Arlen Sarian, Walter Slocum Jr, Arthur Smith, Willard Unrein, Robert Wallen, William Webster, Reginald Willcox, Edward Aitken, Charles Ashbaugh, Harry Ashbaugh, Frank Atwood, Thomas Barker, Lanny Benninger, Eldredge Blain, William Bjorlin, Leslie Burns, Joel Champion, James Chopp, Willis Corcoran, William Damewood, Anson Derby, Clarence Dye, Clifford Echols, Roy Echols, David Fanning, Wesley Feeney Jr, Budd Finch Jr, Errol Ford, Michael Gail, Alonzo Garza, Dennis Gordon, Eldon Harrell, Larry Hartman, Allan Havens, John Hendrickson, Nicholas Herrera, Donald Hull, Raymond Johnson, John Kask, Paul Kornmueller, Charles Klutsch, Joseph Long, Michael Long, Edward Longhini, Joseph Maes, Loren Maes, Gary Malara, David Mathis, Michael McClure, Jerry McDaniel, Mark McKinley, Oscar Metzgar, Steven Moskowitz, Allan Nelson, Robert Nelson, Russell Ness, Paul Nobles, Sven Nylander, Max Oesterle, Dale Olson, David Painter, Thomas Parker, Raymond Patch, Rudolf Peralez, Robert Perlenfien, John Perrine, Wayne Peterson, Louis Price, Jerry Purdy, Ernie Pyle, Ronald Ramirez, Richard Reininger, Frank Ross, Joe Roybal, John Ryan, Genaro Salazar, Raymond Sautter, Robert Schawo, Rudy Schenk, Larry Schwindt, Robert Shaeffer, Dan Shaffer, Roger Smith, Daniel Sorensen, Andrew Stephenson, Marjorie Stephenson, Walter Stolpa Jr, Dwight Strandberg, Barton Thompson, Norman Toman, Richard Tompkins, Samuel Trujillo, Terrence Urista, Myron Wagner, James Wetzler, and Charles Winkleman.●

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD BLATTIE

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Harold Blattie, the outgoing executive director of the Montana Association of Counties, for his longtime commitment to public service in the State of Montana.

Mr. Blattie has dedicated his life to helping preserve our Montana way of life through countless public works projects.

He has served as the executive director of MACo for over a decade, providing strong leadership for Montana's counties and facilitating cooperation between local, State, and Federal leaders to deliver for the residents of Big Sky Country.

Throughout his respected career, he has secured critical resources for citizens from Libby to Baker and Dillon to Plentywood. The residents of our great State owe him a debt of gratitude, and I rise today with a small token of our appreciation.

Mr. Blattie has built his life around building stronger communities.

He is a role model for all Americans, and Montana is a better place because of his work.

I rise today to thank him for all he has done for the Treasure State and wish him all the best of luck in whatever comes next.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, 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.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT RELATIVE TO EXTENDING TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR THREE YEARS—PM 32

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Today, I am requesting that the Congress extend trade authorities procedures for 3 years. As required under section 103(c)(2) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (Trade Priorities Act), I have attached to this message the report describing the progress

that has been made in trade negotiations by my Administration and the reasons why the extension is necessary.

As noted in the 2018 Trade Policy Agenda, my Administration has launched a new era in American trade policy, driven by a determination to use the leverage available to us as the world's largest economy to open foreign markets, and to obtain more efficient global markets and fairer treatment for American workers. One of the major pillars supporting my trade policy is the pursuit of better trade deals.

As you know, my Administration is pursuing the renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement—something many have promised but have failed to deliver. In addition, my Administration is exploring potential trade agreement partners, including in Africa and Southeast Asia.

I hope my Administration can continue to work with the Congress to pursue new and better trade deals for America's workers, farmers, ranchers, and businesses. Extension of trade authorities procedures is essential to fulfill that task and to demonstrate to our trading partners that my Administration and the Congress share a common goal when it comes to trade.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2018.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:15 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2030. An act to deem the compliance date for amended energy conservation standards for ceiling fan light kits to be January 21, 2020, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 835. An act to update the map of, and modify the maximum acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument.

H.R. 4176. An act to strengthen air cargo security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4851. An act to establish the Kennedy-King National Commemorative Site in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5074. An act to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5079. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5099. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a fusion center technical assistance program.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 788. Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable Louise McIntosh Slaughter, a Representative from the State of New York.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2154. An act to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schafer Agricultural Research Center.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 835. An act to update the map of, and modify the maximum acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4176. An act to strengthen air cargo security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5074. An act to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5079. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5099. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a fusion center technical assistance program; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental 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-4619. A communication from the Director of Defense Pricing and Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Amendment to Mentor-Protégé Program" ((RIN0750-AJ05) (DFARS Case 2016-D011)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4620. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William C. Mayville, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4621. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals relative to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4622. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Security Education Program for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4623. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursu-

ant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4624. A communication from the Deputy White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, eighteen (18) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4625. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Encouraging Vaccine Innovation: Promoting the Development of Vaccines that Minimize the Burden of Infectious Diseases in the 21st Century"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4626. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on mining activities as required by the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4627. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the use of the exemption from the antitrust laws provided by the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4628. A communication from the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2017 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4629. A communication from the Chairperson of the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission, transmitting, pursuant to D.C. Code 1-204.34(d) (1), the nomination of Rahkel Bouchet to be an Associate Judge for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4630. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Ohio River, Letart, WV" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0075)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4631. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Monte Foundation Snowfest Fireworks, Tahoe City, Lake Tahoe, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0117)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4632. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; St. Francis Yacht Club Fireworks, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0119)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4633. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Wando Terminal Crane Movement; Charleston, SC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0074)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4634. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Black River, Port Huron, MI" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2017-1047)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4635. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Sturgeon Bay, Sturgeon Bay, WI" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0050)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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-186. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging the United States Department of the Interior to limit the proposed expansion of the national outer continental shelf oil and gas leasing program and to protect the waters off the coasts of the Commonwealth and New England; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, on January 4, 2018, the United States Department of the Interior announced the publication of a Draft Proposed Program in support of its National Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program, and

Whereas, as evidenced in Executive Order 13795, issued by the President of the United States on April 28, 2017, and Order 3350 issued by Secretary Ryan Zinke of the United States Department of the Interior on May 1, 2017, publication of the Draft Proposed Program is a critically important step in an effort by the Federal Government to open up offshore oil drilling in most coastal waters of the United States; and

Whereas, to gauge public reaction and receive substantive input, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management will conduct a public hearing in the city of Boston; and

Whereas, the Draft Proposed Program purports to open up approximately 1.5 billion acres of territory to oil drilling and exploration, including important areas off the coast of Massachusetts and New England, and would approve as many as 47 drilling leases, which would be the largest number of such leases, offered in the history of the United States; and

Whereas, the administration's actions threaten to jeopardize the environmental well being of the Commonwealth and, more particularly, its coastal communities and waters; and

Whereas, the Commonwealth supports Energy Diversity, but the environmental and economic importance of the waters off the coast of the Commonwealth must be weighed against the benefits claimed for speculative offshore drilling, and

Whereas, offshore drilling could threaten the enjoyment of recreational fishing and the vitality of the Commonwealth's Fishing Industry, which provides income and employment for commercial fishermen, vessel manufacturers, restaurants and other businesses throughout Massachusetts; and

Whereas, according to the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Massachusetts Fishing Industry generates 83,000 jobs and approximately \$1.9 billion in income annually; and

Whereas, there is the potential for irreversible damage to areas such as Stellwagen Bank, Georges Bank and Jeffreys Ledge, which are among the richest fishing grounds in the world and are home to a diverse array of Marine Life; and

Whereas, the Commonwealth possesses a pristine and biodiverse coastal zone, which is an essential driver of tourism for the Commonwealth; and

Whereas, the Commonwealth's economy is reliant on tourism, which is its third largest economic sector and responsible for more than 100,000 jobs; and

Whereas, inhabitants of, and visitors to, our coastal communities support many important business sectors ranging from boat manufacturing and repair to tourism activities such as whale and bird watching; and

Whereas, the risk posed by speculative oil exploration initiatives to all of these economic and other existing and known benefits is not justifiable; and

Whereas, on January 9, 2018, the United States Department of the Interior announced that the State of Florida would be exempted from the National Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program, and

Whereas, the Massachusetts Senate opposes the United States Department of the Interior's Draft Proposed Program to vastly expand offshore drilling in America's coastal waters off New England; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Massachusetts Senate hereby memorializes the United States Department of the Interior to take all possible action to protect the waters off the coast of the Commonwealth and New England, in particular Georges Bank, Stellwagen Bank, and Jeffreys Ledge, and exempt these areas from oil exploration initiatives; and be it further

Resolved, that copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to Ryan Zinke, Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, Charles Baker, Governor of the Commonwealth and to the Members of Congress from the Commonwealth.

POM-187. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California relative to a new 5-year National Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program on the Outer Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 73

Whereas, California's iconic coastal and marine waters are one of our state's most precious resources, and it is our duty to protect our coast and ensure the long-term viability of California's wildlife and fisheries resources, as well as the multibillion dollar commercial and recreational fishing and tourism industries; and

Whereas, Hundreds of millions of California residents and visitors enjoy the state's ocean and coast for recreation, exploration, and relaxation; and tourism and recreation comprise the largest sector of the state's \$44.5 billion ocean economy; and

Whereas, 500,000 jobs rely on a clean California coast, including California's \$7 billion commercial fishing industry; and

Whereas, There have been no new offshore oil and gas leases in California since the 1969 blowout of a well in federal waters; and

Whereas, Beginning in 1921, and many times since, the California Legislature has enacted laws that withdrew certain offshore areas from oil and gas leasing, and by 1989 the state's offshore oil and gas leasing moratorium was in place; and

Whereas, In 1994, the California Legislature made findings in Assembly Bill 2444 (Chapter 970 of the Statutes of 1994) that offshore oil and gas production in certain areas of the state's waters poses an unacceptably high risk of damage and disruption to the marine environment; and

Whereas, In the same bill, the Legislature created the California Coastal Sanctuary Act, which included all of the state's unleased waters subject to tidal influence and prohibited new oil and gas leases in the sanctuary, unless the President of the United States has found a severe energy supply interruption and has ordered distribution of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the Governor finds that the energy resources of the sanctuary will contribute significantly to alleviating that interruption, and the Legislature subsequently amends Chapter 970 of the Statutes of 1994 to allow that extraction; and

Whereas, Section 18 of the federal Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. Sec. 1331 et seq.) requires the preparation of a nationwide offshore oil and gas leasing program that sets a five-year schedule of lease sales implemented by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management within the United States Department of the Interior; and

Whereas, Consistent with the principles of Section 18 and the resulting regionally tailored leasing strategy, the current exclusion of the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas development is consistent with the longstanding interests of the Pacific coast states, as framed in the 2006 West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health adopted by the Governors of California, Washington, and Oregon; and

Whereas, In November 2016, the federal Bureau of Ocean Energy Management released a final 2017-22 leasing program that continues the moratorium on oil and gas leasing in the undeveloped areas of the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf; and

Whereas, Governor Brown, in December 2016, requested that then President Obama permanently withdraw California's Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas leasing, and along with previous California Governors, has united with the Governors of Oregon and Washington in an effort to commit to developing robust renewable energy sources to reduce our dependence on fossil fuel and help us reach our carbon emission goals; and

Whereas, The California Legislature has led the nation with its landmark climate change legislation, requiring ambitious greenhouse gas emission reductions of a 40-percent emissions reduction below 1990 levels by 2030, and achieving a renewables portfolio standard of 50 percent by 2030. California must lead the nation in fostering the transition away from offshore fossil fuel production to protect both our climate and oceans from the damaging impacts of climate change, which will affect all life on earth for generations to come; and

Whereas, A Field/IGS (Institute of Governmental Studies) poll in 2016 found 90 percent of Californians believe that protecting the coastline is important and a Public Policy Institute of California 2017 survey found support for drilling here at an all-time low of 25 percent; and

Whereas, President Donald Trump's proposed five-year National Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program represents a renewed call for opening offshore areas for drilling and for lifting moratoriums on energy production in federal areas, that could lead to

more oil spills, increased dependence on fossil fuel, and more damaging impact from climate change; and

Whereas, The California Legislature considers new oil and gas development offshore of the Pacific coast to be a threat to the nation's economy and national security, and to the state's ambitious renewable energy goals; and

Whereas, The California State Senate has previously adopted Senate Resolutions 35, 44, and 51 in 2017, which support the current federal prohibition on new oil or gas drilling in federal waters offshore California, oppose attempts to modify the prohibition, and defend the National Marine Sanctuaries of the United States; and

Whereas, Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke announced plans on January 4, 2018, for a Draft Proposed Program that would include nearly the entire U.S. Outer Continental Shelf for potential oil and gas lease sales pursuant to President Trump's executive order on American energy that was issued on April 28, 2017; and

Whereas, The proposed program would open up 6 leases off the coast of California, which would be the first sale in the Pacific Region since 1984; and

Whereas, Despite the Trump administration's assertion of support for the program from state and local governments, the States of Washington, Oregon, and California have been consistently united in their opposition to any new oil and gas activities off their coasts, which has resulted in the exclusion of the Pacific coast's Outer Continental Shelf from any National Outer Continental Shelf Program since the 1989-92 program; and

Whereas, Republican and Democratic Governors alike are opposed to the expansion of lease sales off the coast of the United States; and

Whereas, The Trump administration announced on January 9, 2018, that it retracted its plan to expand offshore oil leases off the coast of Florida after receiving feedback from Florida Republican Governor Rick Scott, and the Senate believes California should receive this same exemption; and

Whereas, The Trump administration has taken the position that state and local input is an important part of the leasing process; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate strongly urges the President and the Congress of the United States to permanently safeguard and protect the Pacific coast's Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas leasing, and declares the Senate's unequivocal support for the current federal prohibition on new oil or gas drilling in federal waters offshore of the Pacific coast, its opposition to the proposed 5-year National Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program on the Outer Continental Shelf or any attempts to modify that prohibition, and its determination to consider any appropriate actions to maintain the current prohibition; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the National Program Manager of the federal Bureau of Ocean Energy Management as the public comment of the Legislature in opposition to the proposed new 5-year National Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program on the Outer Continental Shelf; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Governor of California, to the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Sec-

retary of the United States Department of the Interior, to the Director of the federal Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and to each member of the California State Senate and Assembly.

POM-188. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to exclude the State of Maine from offshore oil and gas drilling and exploration activities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.P. 1279

Whereas, the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management 2019-2024 National Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Draft Proposed Program has already been released and the programmatic environmental impact statement could be released as early as May 2018; and

Whereas, over 46,319 jobs and more than \$2,300,000,000 of the State's gross domestic product depend on clean, oil-free water and beaches and abundant fish and wildlife; and

Whereas, over 65% of the State's ocean-derived income stems from our tourism and recreation sector, contributing over \$1,200,000,000 to the State's economy, and this economic sector benefits from and depends upon a healthy ocean and coast; and

Whereas, offshore oil and gas drilling and exploration activities place coastal communities at economic and ecological risk from oil spills and the pollution brought by routine drilling operations and onshore industrialization, threatening the quality of life and livelihoods of the State's citizens and important industries, such as tourism and recreation and commercial and recreational fishing, and small businesses that rely on a clean and healthy ocean and beaches; and

Whereas, the State recognizes that our communities and industries depend on a healthy coastal environment for the benefit of current and future residents, property owners and visitors; now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That We, your Memorialists, believe that offshore oil and gas drilling and exploration risks our economic and ecological health and therefore oppose any plan or legislation that encourages oil and gas exploration offshore that would negatively affect the citizens of the State; and be it further

Resolved: That We, your Memorialists, on behalf of the people we represent, take this opportunity to respectfully request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress direct the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to exclude the State and its offshore areas from the 2019-2024 National Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Draft Proposed Program; and be it further

Resolved: That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, to Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke, to National Oil and Gas Leasing Program Development and Coordination Branch Chief Kelly Hammerle, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-189. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan memorializing their support for the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and opposing any reduction in its boundaries; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 222

Whereas, The Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary is one of fourteen U.S. ma-

rine protected areas and the only one located in the Great Lakes. The 4,300-square-mile sanctuary holds nearly 100 known shipwrecks—covering more than 150 years of Great Lakes commerce—remarkably preserved in Lake Huron's cold, fresh waters; and

Whereas, Jointly managed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the state of Michigan, the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary plays an important role in preserving our nation's marine heritage and providing opportunities for future discovery, research, and education. In addition to shipwrecks, the sanctuary encompasses other important cultural and natural features related to maritime heritage including lifesaving stations, lighthouses, historic boats and ships, commercial fishing camps, and working ports. Geological evidence suggests undiscovered prehistoric archaeological sites may also exist; and

Whereas, The United States Secretary of Commerce is currently conducting a review of all designations and expansions of national marine sanctuaries within the last 10 years. Under Executive Order 13795, Implementing an America-First Offshore Energy Strategy, the President of the United States directed the review of the budgetary impacts of the costs of managing the sanctuary, the adequacy of consultations with affected state and tribal governments prior to designation, and opportunity costs associated with potential energy and mineral exploration; and

Whereas, Nearly 3,900 square miles of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary could be impacted by the federal review. Just 448 square miles when initially designated in 2000, the sanctuary was expanded in 2014 to cover 4,300 square miles. The expansion increased the number of protected shipwrecks and opened up new opportunities to study shipwreck sites and maritime history in America; and

Whereas, Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary attracts shipwreck divers and tourists and provides an economic boost to charter boat businesses, dive shops, bike rentals, outfitters, and travel and tourism companies. In past years, recreational activity associated with the sanctuary has provided \$92 million in annual sales, \$35.8 million in personal income to residents of coastal cities located near the sanctuary, and 1,704 jobs. In 2015, over 95,000 people visited the Great Lakes Maritime Heritage Center which is associated with the sanctuary; and

Whereas, Energy and mineral exploration is not appropriate within the sanctuary. Michigan has banned offshore drilling of oil in the Great Lakes since 1982. Congress enacted a temporary ban on offshore drilling in the Great Lakes in 2001 and made the federal ban permanent in 2005. The oil and gas drilling ban is necessary to protect this unique natural resource that provides drinking water and recreational opportunities and supports food production, business, and transportation for all U.S. citizens; and

Whereas, Maintaining the current boundaries of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary supports the rural coastal communities of northeast Michigan as well as protects the health and safety of millions of people who call the Great Lakes Basin home; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the House of Representatives, That we support the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and oppose any reduction in its boundaries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, and the United States Secretary of Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2325. A bill to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-214).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 85. A resolution calling on the Government of Iran to fulfill repeated promises of assistance in the case of Robert Levinson, the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's history.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 432. A resolution congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Robert Frank Pence, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Finland.

Nominee: Robert Frank Pence.

Post: Ambassador to the Republic of Finland.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$5,000.00, 3/19/2013, Heartland Values PAC (Senator Thune); \$2,500.00, 5/13/2013, Ryan For Congress; \$1,000.00, 6/19/2013, Rounds For Senate; \$1,000.00, 9/17/2013, Rounds For Senate; \$2,600.00, 9/18/2013, Capito For West Virginia; \$20,000.00, 9/23/2013, Republican National Committee; \$1,000.00, 9/26/2013, Friends Of Barbara Comstock*; \$2,600.00, 10/16/2013, Texans For Senator John Cornyn Inc.; \$2,600.00, 10/23/2013, McConnell Senate Committee '14; \$2,500.00, 11/26/2013, Tom Cotton For Senate; \$1,000.00, 12/12/2013, Friends Of Randy Forbes; \$2,600.00, 3/05/2014, Texans For Senator John Cornyn Inc.; \$1,000.00, 3/26/2014, Suzanne Scholte For Congress; \$1,000.00, 3/27/2014, Rob Wittman For Congress; \$2,600.00, 3/28/2014, Ed Gillespie For Senate; \$2,600.00, 6/13/2014, Tom Cotton For Senate; \$1,000.00, 6/19/2014, Forbes For Congress; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, Comstock For Congress; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, Ed Gillespie For Senate; \$2,600.00, 7/10/2014, Terri Lynn Land For Senate; \$2,600.00, 9/05/2014, Rob Wittman; \$2,600.00, 9/08/2014, McConnell Senate Committee*; \$1,000.00, 9/29/2014, Cory Gardner For Senate; \$32,400.00, 9/30/2014, NRSC; \$5,200.00, 9/30/2014, Ernst For US Senate*; \$2,000.00, 9/30/2014, Sullivan For US Senate; \$1,000.00, 9/30/2014, Sasse For US Senate; \$2,000.00, 9/30/2014, Scott Brown; \$1,000.00, 10/03/2014, Bill Cassidy For US Senate; \$1,000.00, 10/10/2014, Perdue For US Senate; \$2,500.00, 10/24/2014, Heartland Values PAC (Senator Thune); \$-2,700.00, 8/04/2015, Marco Rubio For President (error); \$2,700.00, 8/04/2015, Marco Rubio For President (error); \$5,400.00, 8/04/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$33,400.00, 10/01/2015, Republican

National Committee; \$1,600.00, 10/01/2015, Republican National Committee; \$5,400.00, 11/10/2015, Ryan Zinke For Congress; \$2,700.00, 2/29/2016, Scott Walker, Inc.; \$50,000.00, 2/23/2016, Marco Rubio-Cons. Sol. PAC; \$50,000.00, 2/26/2016, Marco Rubio-Cons. Sol. PAC; \$50,000.00, 3/02/2016, Marco Rubio-Cons. Sol. PAC; \$2,700.00, 3/15/2016, Portman For Congress; \$2,700.00, 3/15/2016, Portman For Congress; \$-2,700.00, 3/18/2016, Johnson For Senate (error); \$2,700.00, 3/18/2016, Johnson For Senate (error); \$5,400.00, 3/18/2016, Johnson For Senate; \$2,700.00, 3/21/2016, Royce For Congress; \$2,700.00, 3/21/2016, Royce For Congress; \$5,400.00, 3/23/2016, Roy Blunt****; \$-2,700.00, 3/23/2016, Roy Blunt****; \$2,700.00, 3/23/2016, Roy Blunt****; \$5,400.00, 3/30/2016, Friends Of Joe Heck; \$2,700.00, 3/30/2016, Friends Of Joe Heck (error); \$-2,700.00, 3/30/2016, Friends Of Joe Heck (error); \$2,700.00, 3/31/2016, Friends Of Kelly Ayotte; \$2,700.00, 3/31/2016, Friends Of Kelly Ayotte; \$5,000.00, 4/22/2016, Rand Paul 2016; \$-2,300.00, 4/23/2016, Rand Paul 2016 (error); \$2,300.00, 4/23/2016, Rand Paul 2016 (error); \$-2,700.00, 5/13/2016, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,500.00, 5/27/2016, Carlos Lopez-Cantera For Senate check; \$2,700.00, 6/10/2016, Charles Grassley; \$2,700.00, 6/06/2016, Charles Grassley (error, repeated); \$2,700.00, 6/07/2016, Goodlatte For Congress; \$2,700.00, 6/08/2016, Randy Forbes; \$5,400.00, 6/13/2016, Todd Young*; \$5,000.00, 6/27/2016, Team Ryan; \$2,300.00, 6/27/2016, Paul Ryan For Congress (error); \$2,300.00, 6/27/2016, Paul Ryan For Congress (error); \$10,800.00, 6/30/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate; \$10,800.00, 6/30/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate (error, repeat); \$1,600.00, 6/30/2016, NRSC; \$33,400.00, 6/30/2016, NRSC; \$2,700.00, 6/30/2016, Rob Wittman For Congress; \$-5,400.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate; \$2,700.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate (error); \$-2,700.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate (error); \$25,000.00, 9/14/2016, Trump Victory; \$22,300.00, 9/14/2016, RN C****; \$2,700.00, 9/14/2016, Donald Trump for President****; \$5,400.00, 9/22/2016, Friends Of John McCain; \$2,700.00, 9/28/2016, Friends Of Patrick Toomey; \$5,000.00, 10/06/2016, John Bolton Super Pac; \$2,700.00, 10/14/2016, Richard Burr Committee; \$15,000.00, 11/03/2016, NRSC; \$2,700.00, 11/10/2016, John Kennedy For US; \$2,700.00, 11/10/2016, John Kennedy For US (error, repeat); \$5,000.00, 12/05/2016, Republican Majority Fund ****.

Spouse: Susan Sarbacher Pence; \$2,500.00, 5/13/2013, Ryan For Congress; \$2,600.00, 10/16/2013, Texans For Senator John Cornyn Inc.; \$2,600.00, 10/23/2013, McConnell Senate Committee; \$2,600.00, 12/23/2013, Texans For Senator John Cornyn Inc.; \$2,600.00, 3/28/2014, Ed Gillespie For Senate; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, Comstock For Congress; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, Ed Gillespie For Senate; \$2,600.00, 9/08/2014, McConnell Senate Committee; \$2,600.00, 9/30/2014, Cotton For US Senate; \$32,400.00, 9/30/2014, NRSC*; \$2,000.00, 10/02/2014, Brown For US Senate; \$1,000.00, 6/28/2015, Carly For President; \$5,400.00, 6/30/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$-2,700.00, 6/30/2015, Marco Rubio For President (error); \$2,700.00, 6/30/2015, Marco Rubio For President (error); \$5,400.00, 8/04/2015, Rubio For President (error) \$1,700.00, 8/12/2015, Carly For President (C.A.R.L.Y.PAC); \$2,700.00, 2/29/2016, Scott Walker, Inc.; \$5,400.00, 3/15/2016, Rob Portman*; \$-2,700.00, 3/18/2016, Ron Johnson (error); \$2,700.00, 3/18/2016, Ron Johnson (error); \$5,400.00, 3/18/2016, Ron Johnson; \$-5,400.00, 3/23/2016, Friends Of Roy Blunt****; \$-2,700.00, 3/23/2016, Friends Of Roy Blunt****; \$2,700.00, 3/23/2016, Friends Of Ray Blunt****; \$10,800.00, 3/23/2016, Friends Of Roy Blunt****; \$2,700.00, 3/21/2016, Ed Royce Campaign Committee; \$2,700.00, 3/21/2016, Ed Royce Campaign Committee; \$2,700.00, 3/31/2016, Kelly Ayotte; \$2,700.00, 3/31/2016, Kelly Ayotte; \$-2,300.00, 4/22/2016, Rand Paul For US Senate (error); \$2,300.00, 4/22/2016, Rand Paul For US Senate (error); \$2,300.00, 4/22/2016, Rand Paul For US Senate (error); \$5,000.00, 4/22/2016, Rand Paul For US Senate; \$-2,700.00, 5/13/2016, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,700.00, 6/30/2016, Rob Wittman For Congress; \$-2,700.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate; \$2,700.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate**; \$5,400.00, 8/24/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate***; \$5,400.00, 9/15/2016, Young Victory Committee; \$35,000.00, 10/10/2016, NRSC***; \$2,700.00, 10/14/2016, Richard Burr Committee; \$5,000.00, 12/05/2016, Republican Majority Fund****.

Note: With respect to the various contributions and credits to the Rubio Senatorial campaign by Robert Pence, the second \$10,800.00 contribution shown on 6/30/2016 was not made, it is a repeat of the entry that precedes it. With respect to the various contributions and credits to the Rubio Presidential campaign by Susan Pence, the \$5,400.00 contribution shown on 8/04/2015 was not made. The true net result of all of the contributions shown to the Rubio campaigns is that Robert and Susan Pence each gave \$2,700.00 to each of the Presidential primary campaign, the Senate primary campaign, and the Senate general campaign. These numbers were confirmed with the Rubio campaigns on 12/6/2017.

*This contribution was not included on the FEC report.
**The FEC report erroneously repeats these three contributions (it shows the same reference number, 201610170200, except that the "-2,700.00" is turned into a positive "2,700.00"). The three repeated entries are not shown on this form.
***FEC report incorrectly shows only \$1,600.00 but uses the same reference number as the 8/24/16 Rubio contributions/credit.
****This is posted erroneously to Susan Pence in the FEC report.
*****I do not understand this accounting but the result is the same: \$5,400 (net) to Roy Blunt from Robert Pence and \$5,400.00 from Susan Pence. Both were contributed via one (1) credit card charge of \$10,800.00 on 3/21/16.
*****I believe these entries reflect a double counting of 9/14/16 Trump Victory contribution.

3. Children and Spouses: Stephen P. Pence: \$2,600.00, 6/30/2016, Rob Wittman For Congress; \$2,700.00, 7/10/2017, Rob Wittman For Congress; Joelle Pence: None; Geoffrey W. Pence: \$12,000.00, 9/26/2016, NRSC; \$2,700.00, 7/07/2017, Rob Wittman For Congress; Stacy P. Pence: None; Brian F. Pence: \$2,600.00, 6/30/2016, Rob Wittman For Congress; \$2,700.00, 7/07/2017, Rob Wittman For Congress; Leigh Pence: \$12,000.00, 9/26/2016, NRSC.

4. Parents: Frank W. Pence—Deceased; Estella A. Pence—Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Frank M. Pence—Deceased; Bess W. Pence—Deceased; Edna Baker—Deceased; (Unknown) Boyer—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Richard O. Pence—Deceased; Ronald E. Pence—None.

7. Sisters and Spouses—None.

*Edward Charles Prado, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Argentine Republic.
Nominee: Edward Charles Prado.
Post: United States Ambassador to Argentina.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 0;
2. Spouse: 0;
3. Children and Spouses: 0;

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 0;
2. Spouse: 0;
3. Children and Spouses: 0;

- 4. Parents: 0;
- 5. Grandparents: 0;
- 6. Brothers and Spouses: 0;
- 7. Sisters and Spouses: 0.

*Trevor D. Traina, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Austria.

Nominee: Trevor Traina.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Austria.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.¹)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self:

Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts \$500, 8/11/14, Unlocking Potential PAC; \$50,000, 3/31/15, Right to Rise USA.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees \$1,000, 4/24/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$1,000, 6/18/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$600, 6/24/14, California Republican Party Federal Act.; \$32,400, 6/27/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 8/22/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$400, 8/26/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$2,600, 10/1/14, Gardner, Cory via Cory Gardner for Senate; \$4,800, 10/9/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTPAC); \$1,000, 10/11/14, DeMaio, Carl via Carl DeMaio for Congress; \$250, 11/6/14, NRSC; \$5,000, 2/24/15, Right to Rise PAC, Inc; \$2,700, 6/26/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc; \$1,500, 11/11/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 12/31/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc; \$2,300, 1/11/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 1/11/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 2/10/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$500, 3/11/16, Johnson, Ronald Harold via Ron Johnson for Senate Inc; \$2,700, 6/26/16, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$2,700, 7/19/16, Portman, Rob, via Rob Portman for US Senate; \$25,000, 9/19/16, Republican National Committee; \$50,000, 10/10/16, Republican National Committee; \$5,000, 1/1/17, Trump Transition; \$1,100, 3/1/17, Republican National Committee; \$33,900, 3/1/17, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 5/15/17, Handel, Karen Christine via Handel for Congress, Inc.

Joint Fundraising Contributions \$25,000, 3/31/14, Boehner for Speaker; \$5,200, 9/3/14, Rubio Victory Committee; \$5,000, 10/24/16, Young Victory Committee; \$5,000, 11/3/16, Young Victory Committee; \$100,000, 2/23/17, Team Ryan.

Recipient of Joint Fundraiser Contributions \$19,800, 3/31/14, NRCC; \$2,600, 3/31/14, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$2,600, 3/31/14, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$2,080, 9/31/14, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$3,120, 9/3/14, Reclaim America PAC; \$2,700, 10/24/16, Young, Todd Christopher via Friends of Todd Young, Inc; \$2,300, 11/2/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc, \$5,000, 12/23/

16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc; \$5,000, 2/23/17, Prosperity Action, Inc; \$2,700, 2/23/17, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$2,700, 2/23/17, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$33,900, 2/23/17, NRCC.

2. Spouse: Alexis Traina

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees \$2,700, 6/26/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc; \$25,000, 9/19/16, Republican National Committee.

3. Children: Johnny Traina: None. Delphina Traina: None.

4. Mother: Diane B. Wilsey

Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts \$250,000, 1/14/14, Republican Governors Association; \$25,000, 8/14/14, John Bolton Super PAC; \$25,000, 8/25/14, Unlocking Potential PAC; \$100,000, 1/14/15, Right to Rise USA; \$5,000, 2/27/15, Leadership Matters for America PC, Inc.; \$25,000, 4/13/15, Conservative, Authentic, Responsive Leadership for You and America; \$11,824.15, 5/4/15, Right to Rise USA; \$30,000, 9/21/15, Growth Political Action Committee ("GROWTH PAC"); \$50,000, 3/27/17, Citizens Supporting Gavin Newson for Governor 2018; \$3,500, 11/8/17, Congressional Leadership Fund.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees \$32,400, 1/22/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 2/11/14, Strickland, Anthony A via Strickland for Congress; \$32,400, 2/19/14, NRSC; \$2,600, 3/11/14, Condley, Kerri—For Congress 2014; \$2,500, 3/20/14, San Francisco Republican Party; \$1,000, 3/27/14, Hill, James French via French Hill for Arkansas; \$500, 3/31/14, Emily's List; \$5,200, 4/17/14, Ernst, Joni—For US Senate; \$32,400, 4/14/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 4/20/14, CAWG PAC; \$36, 4/22/14, National Republican Senatorial Committee—Sustaining Membership; \$2,600, 4/29/14, Issa Darrell, for Congress; \$2,600, 5/9/14, Gillespie, Edward W via Ed Gillespie for Senate; \$500, 5/27/14, DCCC; \$500, 6/1/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,100, 6/1/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$1,500, 6/19/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTT PAC); \$1,000, 6/9/14, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 8/28/14, California Democratic Party; \$300, 9/3/14, California Republican Party Federal Act.; \$500, 9/5/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$500, 9/9/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTT PAC); \$2,600, 10/6/14, Scott, Timothy E via Tim Scott for Senate; \$500, 10/9/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$1,000, 10/15/14, DeMaio, Carl via Carl DeMaio for Congress; \$32,400, 1/20/15, Republican National Committee; \$500, 1/26/15, California Republican Party Federal Act.; \$1,000, 3/23/15, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 3/31/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$5,400, 4/11/15, Boozman, John via Boozman for Arkansas; \$2,700, 6/30/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc; \$2,700, 9/8/15, Ayotte, Kelly A via Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc; \$1,000, 9/8/15, CAWG PAC; \$2,000, 9/14/15, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$1,000, 9/22/15, Lee, Mike via Friends of Mike Lee Inc; \$2,700, 9/23/15, Fiorina, Carly via Carly for President; \$2,700, 10/8/15, Kirk, Mark Steven via Illinois Lincoln PAC; \$2,700, 10/8/15, Kirk, Mark Steven via Illinois Lincoln PAC; \$1,300, 10/9/15, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,000, 10/23/15, Del Beccaro, Thomas

via Del Beccaro for Senate; \$1,000, 10/23/15, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 11/4/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc; \$11,000, 11/11/15, California Republican Party; \$2,700, 11/11/15, Christie, Chris for President, Inc; \$98,800, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$100,200, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$10,000, 11/18/15, California Republican Party Federal Act.; \$2,700, 11/23/15, Scott, Timothy E via Tim Scott for Senate; \$2,700, 12/30/15, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$250,000, 2/8/16, Republican Governors Association (2015 Membership); \$33,400, 2/10/16, NRSC; \$1,300, 2/25/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,400, 2/25/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$4,400, 3/2/16, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$1,000, 3/18/16, Condley, Kerri via Kerri Condley for Congress; \$2,700, 3/31/16, Kasich John R via Kasich for America, Inc; \$2,700, 4/28/16, Conlon, Greg via Greg Conlon for US Senate; \$1,000, 5/2/16, Toomey, Pat (Friends of Senator); \$5,400, 5/24/16, Johnson, Ronald Harold via Ron Johnson for Senate Inc; \$1,000, 5/25/16, CAWG PAC; \$300, 5/31/16, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$700, 5/31/16, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 6/13/16, Ayotte, Kelly A via Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc; \$2,700, 6/14/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 6/22/16, College Republican National Committee; \$5,400, 8/10/16, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for Senate; \$50,000, 9/15/16, Committee on Jobs—Govt Reform Fund; \$5,000, 9/30/16, San Francisco Republican Party; \$1,400, 9/30/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$25,000, 9/30/16, Republican National Committee; \$5,000, 10/18/16, North Carolina Republican Party; \$1,000, 10/19/16, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$2,700, 10/21/16, Burr, Richard M via Richard Burr Committee; \$15,000, 10/24/16, California Republican Party Federal Act.; \$500, 11/11/16, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$33,900, 2/15/17, NRSC; \$66,100, 2/15/17, NRSC; \$2,700, 2/17/17, King, Angus Stanley Jr via Angus King for US Senate Campaign; \$100,000, 2/21/17, Republican Governors Association; \$2,700, 3/23/17, Barrasso, John A via Friends of John Barrasso; \$3,400, 4/7/17, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$50,000, 4/18/17, Republican Attorneys General Association; \$2,700, 5/17/17, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,000, 6/13/17, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$11,000, 8/9/17, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$1,000, 8/24/17, Wicker for Senate (Scott Wicker); \$2,700, 9/13/17, Wicker for Senate (Scott Wicker); \$5,400, 11/10/17, I Like Luke (Luke Messer for Senate, Indiana); \$5,400, 11/15/17, Denham, Jeff for Congress; \$5,000, 11/15/17, Great America Committee; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Knight, Steve, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Rohrbacher, Dana, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Royce, Ed, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Walters, Mimi for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Valadao, David for Congress; \$10,000, 11/15/17, California Republican Party Federal Act.; \$200, 11/17/17, Thompson, Mike, for Congress; \$5,400, 12/13/17, Fagg, Russ, Senate Committee; \$5,400, 12/22/17, Mortensen, Michelle via Mortensen for Congress; \$33,900, 12/28/17, Republican National Committee (RNC); \$5,400, 1/16/18, Harkey, Diane, for Congress.

Joint Fundraising Contributions \$5,200, 3/24/14, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$42,600, 8/22/14, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$5,200, 9/3/14, Rubio Victory Committee; \$1,000, 9/4/14, MRP Victory; \$10,400, 9/24/14, Winning Woman for the US Senate; \$10,000, 10/28/14, Targeted State Victory; \$20,000, 10/31/14, Boehner for Speaker; \$100,200, 4/15/15, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$5,000, 2/18/15, Leadership Matters for America PAC; \$500, 9/2/15, Boehner for Speaker; \$10,000, 10/1/15, Kamala Harris Victory

¹In addition to my family members listed in this report, my former step-father (now deceased) had five children, by former wives, and my former step-mother had two children by former husbands. Of these seven children of my former step-parents, one is deceased and I do not know, and have not stayed in contact with, any of the others. I have not included these step-relatives in this report.

Fund; \$254,600, 3/21/16, Ryan-McCarthy Victory; \$200,000, 6/10/16, NRSC Targeted State Victory Committee; \$1,000, 10/19/16, Woman Making History Fund; \$43,800, 1/26/17, McCarthy Victory Fund; \$120,000, 2/13/17, Team Ryan; \$15,400, 3/31/17, Ernst Victory Iowa; \$50,000, 4/21/17, Iowa Values; \$5,400, 4/28/17, Sasse Leadership Committee; \$33,900, 6/13/17, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$10,800, 9/21/17, Team Graham; \$1,000, 11/10/17, Independent Women's Voice.

Recipient of Joint Fundraiser Contributions \$5,000, 3/24/14, Invest in a Strong and Secure America; \$10,400, 8/18/14, NRCC; \$32,200, 8/18/14, NRCC; \$2,080, 9/13/14, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Wehby, Monica via Dr Monica Wehby for US Senate; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Capito, Shelley Moore Ms. via Capito for West Virginia; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Land, Terri Lynn via Terri Lynn Land for Senate; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Land, Terri Lynn via Terri Lynn Land for Senate; \$3,333.33, 10/28/14, Republican Party of Iowa; \$10,000, 10/31/14, Ohio Republican Party State Central & Executive Committee; \$3,333.33, 10/31/14, North Carolina Republican Party; \$5,000, 10/31/14, Freedom Project; The; \$100,200, 4/15/15, NRCC; \$500, 9/2/15, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$10,000, 12/1/15, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 3/21/16, Majority Committee PAC—MC PAC; \$33,400, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$100,200, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$100,200, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$2,700, 3/21/16, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$2,700, 3/21/16, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$2,700, 3/21/16, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$2,700, 3/21/16, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania; \$50,000, 6/10/16, NRSC; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Arizona Republican Party; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Missouri Republican State Committee—Federal; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Nevada Republican Central Committee; \$10,000, 6/27/16, Oklahoma Leadership Council; \$10,000, 7/8/16, Republican Party of Florida; \$10,000, 8/26/16, New Hampshire Republican State Committee; \$10,000, 10/4/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc; \$10,000, 10/25/16, Republican Party of Iowa; \$10,000, 10/26/16, Republican Party of Kentucky; \$10,000, 11/16/16, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 1/26/17, Majority Committee PAC—MC PAC; \$33,400, 1/26/17, NRCC; \$2,700, 1/26/17, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$2,700, 1/26/17, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$500, 2/13/17, NRCC; \$5,000, 2/13/17, Prosperity Action Inc; \$2,700, 2/13/17, Ryan, Paul D via Paul for Congress, Inc.; \$2,700, 2/13/17, Ryan, Paul D via Paul for Congress, Inc.; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Ernst, Joni K via Joni for Iowa; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Ernst, Joni K via Joni for Iowa; \$5,000, 3/31/17, Jobs Opportunity and New Ideas PAC; \$2,700, 4/7/17, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$5,000, 6/13/17, Invest in a Strong and Secure America; \$2,700, 6/13/17, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$26,200, 6/13/17, NRCC.

John A. Traina: Deceased.

5. Ruth H Buchanan: None; Wiley T Buchanan: Deceased; John A Traina: Deceased; Lea C Traina: Deceased.

6. John Todd Traina:

Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts \$20,000, 7/22/15, Growth Political Action Committee.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees \$500, 7/3/14, Logue, Daniel via Friends of Dan Logue for Congress; \$500, 10/8/14, Gorell, Jeff via Gorell for Congress; \$500, 7/1/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 9/3/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc.; \$2,700, 9/29/15, Kefalas, Chrysovalantis P via Kefalas for Maryland Inc.; \$1,000, 5/18/16, Harris, Kamala via Kamala Harris for Senate.

Katie Orr Traina: None; Maximillian John Alexander Traina: None.

7. Samantha L Traina: None; Vanessa D Traina: None; Charles de Viel Castel (spouse): None; Victoria L Traina: None; Zara Traina: None.

—
Name: Trevor Traina.

Position nominated for: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Austria.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this attachment is complete and accurate.¹)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Trevor Traina, Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts: \$500, 8/11/14, Unlocking Potential PAC; \$50,000, 3/31/15, Right to Rise USA.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees: \$1,000, 4/24/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTAPAC); \$1,000, 6/18/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTAPAC); \$600, 6/24/14, California Republican Party Federal Acct.; \$32,400, 6/27/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 8/22/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTAPAC); \$400, 8/26/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTAPAC); \$2,600, 10/1/14, Gardner, Cory via Cory Gardner for Senate; \$4,800, 10/9/14 Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (SCOTTAPAC); \$1,000, 10/11/14, Demaio, Carl via Carl Demaio for Congress; \$250, 11/6/14, NRSC; \$5,000, 2/24/15, Right to Rise PAC, Inc; \$2,700, 6/26/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc; \$1,500, 11/11/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 12/31/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc; \$2,300, 1/11/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 1/11/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 2/10/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$500, 3/11/16, Johnson, Ronald Harold via Ron Johnson for Senate Inc; \$2,700, 6/26/16, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$2,700, 7/19/16, Portman, Rob via Rob Portman for US Senate; \$25,000, 9/19/16, Republican National Committee; \$50,000, 10/10/16, Republican National Committee; \$5,000, 1/1/17, Trump Transition; \$1,100, 3/1/17, Republican National Committee; \$33,900, 3/1/17, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 5/15/17, Handel, Karen Christine via Handel for Congress, Inc.

Joint Fundraising Contributions: \$25,000, 3/31/14, Boehner for Speaker; \$5,200, 9/3/14, Rubio Victory Committee; \$5,000, 10/24/16, Young Victory Committee; \$5,000, 11/3/16, Young Victory Committee; \$100,000, 2/23/17, Team Ryan.

Recipient of Joint Fundraiser Contributions: \$19,800, 3/31/14, NRCC; \$2,600, 3/31/14, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$2,600, 3/31/14, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$2,080, 9/3/14, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$3,120, 9/3/14, Reclaim America PAC; \$2,700, 10/24/16, Young, Todd Christopher via Friends of Todd Young, Inc; \$2,300, 11/2/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc; \$5,000, 12/23/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc; \$5,000, 2/23/17, Prosperity Action, Inc; \$2,700, 2/23/17, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$2,700, 2/23/17, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$33,900, 2/23/17, NRCC.

State and Local Contributions: \$15,000, 2014, Brown Jr., Edmund, Governor of California; \$5,200, 2014, Martinez, Susana & Sanchez, John, Governor and Lieutenant Governor of New Mexico; \$3,500, 2014, Walker, Scott & Kleefisch, Rebecca Governor and

Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin; \$2,500, 2014, Harris, Kamala, Attorney General of California; \$1,000, 2014, Baker, Catharine, Assembly District in California; \$250, 2014, Raimondo, Gina, Governor of Rhode Island.

2. Alexis Traina, Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees: 2,700, 6/26/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc; \$25,000, 9/19/16, Republican National Committee.

State and Local Contributions: \$3,800, 2013, Christie, Chris & Guadagno, Kim, Governor and Lieutenant Governor of New Jersey.

3. Johnny Traina: none; Delphina Traina: none.

4. Diane B. Wilsey, Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts: \$250,000, 1/14/14, Republican Governors Association; \$25,000, 8/14/14, John Bolton Super Pac; \$25,000, 8/25/14, Unlocking Potential Pac; \$100,000, 1/14/15, Right To Rise USA; \$5,000, 2/27/15, Leadership Matters for America PC, Inc; \$25,000, 4/13/15, Conservative, Authentic, Responsive Leadership for you and America; \$11,824.15, 5/4/15, Right to Rise USA; \$30,000, 9/21/15, Growth Political Action Committee ('Growth Pac); \$50,000, 3/27/17, Citizens Supporting Gavin Newson for Governor 2018; \$3,500, 11/8/17, Congressional Leadership Fund.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint Fundraising Committees: \$32,400, 1/22/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 2/11/14, Strickland, Anthony A via Strickland for Congress; \$32,400, 2/19/14, NRSC; \$2,600, 3/11/14, Condlery, Kerri—for Congress 2014; \$2,500, 3/20/14, San Francisco Republican Party; \$1,000, 3/27/14, Hill, James French via French Hill for Arkansas; \$500, 3/31/14, Emily's List; \$5,200, 4/17/14, Ernst, Joni—for US Senate; \$32,400, 4/14/14, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 4/20/14, CAWG PAC; \$36, 4/22/14, National Republican Senatorial Committee.

Sustaining Membership: \$2,600, 4/29/14, Issa Darrell for Congress; \$2,600, 5/9/14, Gillespie, Edward W via Ed Gillespie for Senate; \$500, 5/27/14, DCCC; \$500, 6/1/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,100, 6/1/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$1,500, 6/19/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (Scott Pac); \$1,000, 6/9/14, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 8/28/14, California Democratic Party; \$300, 9/3/14, California Republican Party Federal Acct; \$500, 9/5/14, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for; \$500, 9/9/14, Brown, Scott via Strong Country for Today and Tomorrow (Scott Pac); \$2,600, 10/6/14, Scott, Timothy E via Tim Scott for Senate; \$500, 10/9/14, Thompson, Mike Mr via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$1,000, 10/15/14, Demaio, Carl via Carl Demaio for Congress; \$32,400, 1/20/15, Republican National Committee; \$500, 1/26/15, California Republican Party Federal Acct; \$1,000, 2/4/15, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$33,400, 2/6/15, National Republican Senatorial Cmtee—Majority.

Makers: \$7,971.14, 3/10/15, Boehner, John; \$500, 3/12/15, California Republican Party Federal Acct; \$100, 3/20/15, NRCC; \$1,000, 3/23/15, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 3/31/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$5,400, 4/11/15, Boozman, John via Boozman for Arkansas; \$2,700, 6/30/15, Bush, Jeb via Jeb 2016, Inc; \$2,700, 9/8/15, Ayotte, Kelly A via Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc; \$1,000, 9/8/15, CAWG PAC; \$2,000, 9/14/15, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$1,000, 9/22/15, Lee, Mike via Friends of Mike Lee Inc; \$2,700, 9/23/15, Fiorina, Carly via Carly for President; \$2,700, 10/8/15, Kirk, Mark Steven via Illinois Lincoln Pac; \$2,700, 10/8/15, Kirk, Mark Steven via Illinois Lincoln Pac; \$1,300, 10/9/15, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,000 10/23/15 Del Beccaro, Thomas via

Del Beccaro for Senate; \$1,000, 10/23/15, Thompson, Mike Mr via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 11/4/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc; \$11,000, 11/11/15, California Republican Party; \$2,700, 11/11/15, Christie, Chris, for President, Inc.; \$98,800, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$100,200, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$1,000, 11/12/15, Republican National Committee; \$10,000, 11/18/15, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$2,700, 11/23/15, Scott, Timothy E via Tim Scott for Senate; \$2,700, 12/30/15, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$250,000, 2/8/16, Republican Governors Association (2015 Membership); \$33,400, 2/10/16, NRSC; \$1,300, 2/25/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,400, 2/25/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$4,400, 3/2/16, Portman, Rob the Honora via Portman for Senate Committee; \$1,000, 3/18/16, Condley, Kerri via Kerri Condley for Congress; \$2,700, 3/31/16, Kasich John R via Kasich for America, Inc; \$2,700, 4/28/16, Conlon, Greg via Greg Conlon for US Senate; \$1,000, 5/2/16, Toomey, Pat (Friends of Senator); \$5,400, 5/24/16, Johnson, Ronald Harold via Ron Johnson for Senate Inc; \$1,000, 5/25/16, CAWG PAC; \$300, 5/31/16, Thompson, Mike Mr via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$700, 5/31/16, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$2,700, 6/13/16, Ayotte, Kelly A via Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc; \$2,700, 6/14/16, Heck, Joe via Friends of Joe Heck; \$5,000, 6/22/16, College Republican National Committee; \$5,400, 8/10/16, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for Senate; \$50,000, 9/15/16, Committee on Jobs—Govt Reform Fund \$5,000, 9/30/16, San Francisco Republican Party; \$1,400, 9/30/16, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$25,000, 9/30/16, Republican National Committee; \$5,000, 10/18/16, North Carolina Republican Party; \$1,000, 10/19/16, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$2,700, 10/21/16, Burr, Richard M via Richard Burr Committee; \$10,000, 10/24/16, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$500, 11/11/16, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$33,900, 2/15/17, NRSC; \$66,100, 2/15/17, NRSC; \$2,700, 2/17/17, King, Angus Stanley Jr. via Angus King for US Senate Campaign; \$100,000, 2/21/17, Republican Governors Association; \$2,700, 3/23/17, Barrasso, John A via Friends of John Barrasso; \$3,400, 4/7/17, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$50,000, 4/18/17, Republican Attorneys General Association; \$2,700, 5/17/17, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$1,000, 6/13/17, Thompson, Mike Mr. via Mike Thompson for Congress; \$11,000, 8/9/17, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$1,000, 8/24/17, Wicker for Senate (Scott Wicker); \$2,700, 9/13/17, Wicker for Senate (Scott Wicker); \$5,400, 11/10/17, I Like Luke (Luke Messer for Senate, Indiana); \$5,400, 11/15/17, Denham, Jeff for Congress; \$5,000, 11/15/17, Great America Committee; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Knight, Steve, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Rohrbacher, Dana, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Royce, Ed, for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Walters, Mimi for Congress; \$5,400, 11/15/17, Valadao, David for Congress; \$10,000, 11/15/17, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$200, 11/17/17, Thompson, Mike, for Congress; \$5,400, 12/13/17, Pagg, Russ, Senate Committee; \$5,400, 12/22/17, Mortensen, Michelle via Mortensen for Congress; \$33,900, 12/28/17, Republican National Committee (RNC); \$5,400, 1/16/18, Harkey, Diane, for Congress.

Joint Fundraising Contributions \$5,200, 3/24/14, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$42,600, 8/22/14, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$5,200, 9/3/14, Rubio Victory Committee; \$1,000, 9/4/14, MRP Victory; \$10,400, 9/24/14, Winning Woman for The US Senate; \$10,000, 10/28/14, Targeted State Victory; \$20,000, 10/31/14, Boehner for Speaker; \$100,200, 4/15/15, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$5,000, 2/18/15, Leadership Matters for America PAC; \$500, 9/2/15, Boehner for Speaker; \$10,000, 10/1/15, Kamala Harris Victory

Fund; \$254,600, 3/21/16, Ryan-McCarthy Victory; \$200,000, 6/10/16, NRSC Targeted State Victory Committee; \$1,000, 10/19/16, Woman Making History Fund; \$43,800, 1/26/17, McCarthy Victory Fund; \$120,000, 2/13/17, Team Ryan; \$15,400, 3/31/17, Ernst Victory Iowa; \$50,000, 4/21/17, Iowa Values; \$5,400, 4/28/17, Sasse Leadership Committee; \$33,900, 6/13/17, Darrell Issa Victory Fund; \$10,800, 9/21/17, Team Graham; \$1,000, 11/10/17, Independent Women's Voice.

Recipient of Joint Fundraiser Contributions \$5,000, 3/24/14, Invest in a Strong and Secure America; \$10,400, 8/18/14, NRCC; \$32,200, 8/18/14, NRCC; \$2,080, 9/13/14, Rubio, Marco via Marco Rubio for President; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Wehby, Monica via Dr. Monica Wehby for US Senate; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Capito, Shelley Moore Ms. via Capito for West Virginia; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Land, Terri Lynn via Terri Lynn Land for Senate; \$2,600, 9/24/14, Land, Terri Lynn via Terri Lynn Land for Senate; \$3,333.33, 10/28/14, Republican Party of Iowa; \$10,000, 10/31/14, Ohio Republican Party State Central & Executive Committee; \$3,333.33, 10/31/14, North Carolina Republican Party; \$5,000, 10/31/14, Freedom Project; The; \$100,200, 4/15/15, NRCC; \$500, 9/2/15, Boehner, John A via Friends of John Boehner; \$10,000, 12/1/15, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 3/21/16, Majority Committee PAC—MC PAC; \$33,400, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$100,200, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$100,200, 3/21/16, NRCC; \$2,700, 3/21/16, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$2,700, 3/21/16, Ryan, Paul D via Ryan for Congress, Inc; \$2,700, 3/21/16, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$2,700, 3/21/16, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania; \$50,000, 6/10/16, NRSC; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Republican Party of Wisconsin; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Arizona Republican Party; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Missouri Republican State Committee—Federal; \$10,000, 6/10/16, Nevada Republican Central Committee; \$10,000, 6/27/16, Oklahoma Leadership Council; \$10,000, 7/8/16, Republican Party of Florida; \$10,000, 8/26/16, New Hampshire Republican State Committee; \$10,000, 10/4/16, Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc; \$10,000, 10/25/16, Republican Party of Iowa; \$10,000, 10/26/16, Republican Party of Kentucky; \$10,000, 11/16/16, California Democratic Party; \$5,000, 1/26/17, Majority Committee PAC—MC PAC; \$33,400, 1/26/17, NRCC; \$2,700, 1/26/17, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$2,700, 1/26/17, McCarthy, Kevin via Kevin McCarthy for Congress; \$500, 2/13/17, NRCC; \$5,000, 2/13/17, Prosperity Action Inc.; \$2,700, 2/13/17, Ryan, Paul D via Paul for Congress, Inc.; \$2,700, 2/13/17, Ryan, Paul D via Paul for Congress, Inc.; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Ernst, Joni K via Joni for Iowa; \$2,700, 3/31/17, Ernst, Joni K via Joni for Iowa; \$5,000, 3/31/17, Jobs Opportunity And New Ideas PAC; \$2,700, 4/7/17, Feinstein, Dianne via Feinstein for Senate 2018; \$5,000, 6/13/17, Invest in a Strong and Secure America; \$2,700, 6/13/17, Issa, Darrell via Issa for Congress; \$26,200, 6/13/17, NRCC.

State and Local Contributions: \$100,000, 2016, Safety for All, Newsom Ballot Measure Committee; \$100,000, 2016, San Franciscans Against Wasteful Spending; \$75,000, 2016, Yes on Public Health & Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A; \$56,400 2015 Newsom, Gavin, Governor of California; \$50,000, 2016, SF Alliance for Jobs & Sustainable Growth PAC; \$25,000, 2016, Great Schools for All (Prop A); \$20,000, 2015, SF Housing Now; \$20,000, 2016, San Franciscan Against Wasteful Spending; \$20,000, 2016, Farrell, Mark, for SF DCCC; \$19,000, 2015, Committee for a Progressive and Affordable SF; \$15,000, 2014, Children and Family First Committee (Prop C), CA; \$15,000, 2014, Cmtee For Reliable Transport, & Better, Safer Streets (Prop A); \$15,000, 2016, SF Alliance for Jobs & Sustainable Growth PAC; \$14,600, 2017, Kounalakis, Eleni Lieutenant Governor

of California; \$14,600, 2017, Padilla, Alex Secretary of State of California; \$14,000, 2016, Ma, Fiona Treasurer for California; \$13,600, 2014, Newsom, Gavin Lieutenant Governor of California; \$10,400, 2014, Martinez, Susana & Sanchez, John Governor and Lieutenant Governor of New Mexico; \$10,000, 2014, CCAG (Concerned Citizens about Casino Gambling) RI; \$10,000, 2015, San Franciscans for Clean Power, Yes on H, No on G; \$10,000, 2016, Anderson, Kat, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Baraka, Keith, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Hsieh, Tom A., for SF DCCC; \$10,000, 2016, Jung, Mary, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, McNeil, Trevor, for SF DCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Murase, Emily, for SF DCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Philhour, Marian, for DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Pimentel, Leah, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Prozan, Rebecca, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Rosenthal, Alix, for SF DCCC 2016; \$10,000, 2016, Safety for All, Newsom Ballot Measure Committee; \$8,800, 2017, Wiener, Scott, for State Senate 2020; \$9,600, 2017, Cohen, Malla for State Board of Equalization 2018; \$8,400, 2015, Wiener, Scott California Senate; \$7,600, 2017, Yee, Betty Controller for California; \$7,000, 2015, Yee, Betty, for Controller 2018; \$6,100, 2016, McCrory, Patrick Governor of North Carolina; \$5,172.34, 2016, Breed, London, for DCCC 2016; \$5,000, 2016, Breed, London for DCCC 2016; \$5,000, 2017, Early, Eric, for Attorney General 2018; \$5,000, 2016, Breed, London for DCCC 2016; \$5,000, 2016, San Franciscans for the Arts & Ending Family Homelessness; \$5,000, 2017, Cohen, Malla, for State Board of Equalization 2018; \$4,400, 2017, Baker, Catherine, for Assembly 2018; \$4,200, 2016, Ting, Phil Assembly District in California; \$4,200, 2015, Wiener, Scott for State Senate; \$4,200, 2015, Wiener, Scott for State Senate; \$4,200, 2016, Baker, Catherine for Assembly 2016; \$4,300, 2015, Baker, Catherine, For Assembly; \$4,100, 2014, Ting, Phil Assembly District in California; \$4,000, 2017, Baker, Catherine, for Assembly 2018; \$3,500, 2014, Haley, Nikki Governor of South Carolina; \$3,400, 2014, Swearengin, Ashley Controller for California; \$3,100, 2014, Yee, Betty Controller for California; \$2,600, 2017, Bottoms, Keisha Lance, for Mayor; \$2,500, 2017, Breed, London, for DCCC; \$2,500, 2016, Pence, Mike Governor of Indiana; \$2,500, 2014, Baker-Polito Inaugural Committee; \$2,500, 2017, Pedroza, Alfredo, Friends of; \$2,000, 2017, Ting, Phil, for Assembly 2018; \$1,000, 2014, Rauner, Bruce & Sanguinetti Evelyn Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Illinois; \$1,000, 2014, Citizens for Rauner, IL; \$1,000, 2017, Safe Neighborhoods for All; \$1,000, 2014, Migden, Carole—for DCCC 2016; \$1,000, 2015, FarmPAC; \$1,000, 2015, Friends of Mark Luce for Supervisor 2016; \$1,000, 2015, Friends of Scott Walker; \$1,000, 2015, Migden, Carole—for DCCC 2016; \$1,000, 2016, Committee to Elect Shepp for Supervisor 2016; \$1,000, 2017, Walker, Scott, Friends of; \$1,000, 2018, Walker, Scott, Friends of; \$750, 2014, Dunn, Damon Mayor of Long Beach, California; \$600, 2014, Newsom, Gavin, Lieutenant Governor—2014; \$500, 2017, Josefowitz, Nick, for Supervisor 2018; \$500, 2014, Adachi, Jeff—For Public Defender; \$500, 2017, Sheehy, Jeff for Supervisor 2018; \$500, 2016, Hsieh, Tom A., for SF DCCC; \$500, 2016, Lee, David, for supervisor; \$500, 2014, The Baker Committee; \$500, 2017, Chu, Carmen—For Assessor-Recorder; \$500, 2014, The Polito Committee; \$500, 2014, Chu, Carmen—For Assessor-Recorder, CA; \$500, 2014, Lee, Ed for Mayor 2015; \$500, 2014, Yee, Betty—For Controller 2014; \$500, 2014, Breed, London, For Supervisor; \$500, 2015, Herrera, Dennis, for City Attorney 2015; \$500, 2018, Breed, London, for Mayor 2018; \$500, 2015, Philhour, Marjan, for Supervisor 2016; \$250, 2014, Ammiano, Tom—2014 Officer Holder;

John A. Traina: Deceased.

5. Ruth H Buchanan: None; Wiley T Buchanan: Deceased; John A Traina: Deceased; Lea C Traina: Deceased.

6. John Todd Traina: *Contributions to Super PACs, Hybrid PACs and Historical Soft Money Party Accounts*: \$20,000, 7/22/15, Growth Political Action Committee.

Contributions to All Other Political Committees Except Joint, Fundraising Committees: \$500, 7/3/14, Logue, Daniel via Friends of Dan Logue for Congress; \$500, 10/8/14, Gorell, Jeff via Gorell for Congress; \$500, 7/1/15, Harris, Kamala D via Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,700, 9/3/15, Christie, Christopher J via Chris Christie for President Inc; \$2,700, 9/29/15, Kefalas, Chrysovalantis P via Kefalas for Maryland Inc; \$1,000, 5/18/16, Harris, Kamala via Kamala Harris for Senate.

State and Local Contributions: \$1,500, 2014, Deramel, Guillaume Secretary of State of Rhode Island.

Katie Orr Traina: None; Maximillian John Alexander Traina: None;

7. Samantha L Traina: None; Vanessa D Traina: None; Charles de Viel Castel (spouse): None; Victoria L Traina: None; Zara Traina: None.

¹In addition to my family members listed in this attachment, my former step-father (now deceased) had five children, by former wives, and my former step-mother had two children by former husbands. Of these seven children of my former step-parents, one is deceased and I do not know, and have not stayed in contact with, any of the others I have not included these step-relatives in this attachment.

*Erik Bethel, of Florida, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years.

*Judy Lynn Shelton, of Virginia, to be United States Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

*Andrea L. Thompson, of South Dakota, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

*Sean Cairncross, of Minnesota, to be Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation.

*Kevin Edward Moley, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Organization Affairs).

*Josephine Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

*Marie Royce, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

By Mr. INHOFE for Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Timothy J. Hilty, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Matthew J. Kohler, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Vincent K. Becklund and ending with Brig. Gen. Stephen C. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. James W. Bierman, Jr. and ending with Brig. Gen. Thomas D. Weidley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018. (minus 1 nominee: Brig. Gen. Norman L. Cooling)

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Timothy M. Ray, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. David D. Thompson, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Christopher W. Grady, to be Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Timothy J. White, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. David A. Welch, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Scott A. Stearney, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. INHOFE for Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of Arthur W. Primas, Jr., to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Gregory J. Payne, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Michael J. Patterson, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Brad R. Matherne, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Jonathan A. Morris, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Rachel L. Adair and ending with D014124, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Rose Abido and ending with Joseph P. Wzorek II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with John P. Kilbride and ending with John J. Neal, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Gregory J. Abide and ending with G010452, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Steven Abadia and ending with G010479, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Army nomination of Steven M. Hemmann, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Hayley R. Ashbaugh and ending with Jordan N. Yolles, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Jeffrey A. Anderson and ending with D012878, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Ahmad B. Alexander and ending with Steven D. Zumbun, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Ashley K. Aiton and ending with Tracy L. Zinn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nomination of Wilson R. Ramos, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Curtis D. Bowe, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Carl E. Foster III, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Michael A. Fowles, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Andrew K. Sinden, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with D013264 and ending with D013298, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nomination of Christopher F. Ruder, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with John J. Morris and ending with Min S. Ro, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 12, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher M. Bell and ending with Adriana B. DeJulio, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 12, 2018.

Army nomination of Mikal L. Stoner, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Eric G. Burns and ending with David P. Sheehan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Thesolina D. Hubert and ending with Timothy W. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 18, 2018.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Benjamin S. Adams and ending with Carl L. Zeppegno, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 2018.

Marine Corps nomination of Aaron J. King, to be Major.

Navy nomination of Jeffrey G. Bentson, to be Commander.

*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. CASEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BENNET, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2572. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for herself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2573. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to reauthorize the appropriate technology transfer for rural areas program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2574. A bill to provide rental assistance to low-income tenants of certain multi-family rural housing projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 2575. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of audiologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing audiology services under the Medicare program, to improve access to the audiology services available for coverage

under the Medicare program and to enable beneficiaries to have their choice of a qualified audiologist to provide such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 2576. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a proceeding to determine whether certain activities by licensees of the Commission are undertakings under division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, or major Federal actions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HELLER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2577. A bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2578. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Commerce to provide advanced notice to Congress before changing any questions on the decennial census, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 2579. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and expand a program of surveillance and education, carried out by the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention, regarding infections associated with injection drug use; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2580. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to make clear that each decennial census, as required for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States, shall tabulate the total number of persons in each State, and to provide that no information regarding United States citizenship or immigration status may be elicited in any such census; 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. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 440. A resolution designating April 2018 as "Second Chance Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 591

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Hamp-

shire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 591, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 661

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 661, a bill to assist entrepreneurs, support development of the creative economy, and encourage international cultural exchange, and for other purposes.

S. 905

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 905, a bill to require a report on, and to authorize technical assistance for, accountability for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1112

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 1917

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1917, a bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1988

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1988, a bill to streamline broadband infrastructure permitting on established public rights-of-way, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2085, a bill to amend the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 to streamline applica-

tion processes and reduce the administrative burden for the commodity supplemental food program, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2244

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2244, a bill to create opportunities for women in the aviation industry.

S. 2278

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2278, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to improve health care in rural areas.

S. 2343

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2343, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a task force for meeting the connectivity and technology needs of precision agriculture in the United States.

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2374, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay Initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2387

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2387, a bill to provide better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and their caregivers while accelerating progress toward prevention strategies, disease modifying treatments, and, ultimately, a cure.

S. 2421

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) 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.

S. 2495

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Tennessee

(Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2495, a bill to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2500

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2500, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the vehicles, weaponry, and ammunition to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 2502

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2502, a bill to address gun violence, improve the availability of records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, address mental illness in the criminal justice system, and end straw purchases and trafficking of illegal firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2515

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2515, a bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

S. 2563

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2563, a bill to improve the water supply and drought resilience of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2565

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2565, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide child care assistance to veterans receiving certain training or voca-

tional rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

S. RES. 224

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 224, a resolution recognizing the 5th anniversary of the death of Oswaldo Paya Sardinias, and commemorating his legacy and commitment to democratic values and principles.

S. RES. 376

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 376, a resolution urging the Governments of Burma and Bangladesh to ensure the safe, dignified, voluntary, and sustainable return of the Rohingya refugees who have been displaced by the campaign of ethnic cleansing conducted by the Burmese military.

S. RES. 407

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. RES. 432

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 432, a resolution congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence.

AMENDMENT NO. 2213

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2213 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1865, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify

that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HELLER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2577. A bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 2577

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 "Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 40701) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking "2014 through 2019" and inserting "2019 through 2024"; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking "2014 through 2019" and inserting "2019 through 2024"; and

(2) in subsection (j), by striking "2015 through 2019" and inserting "2019 through 2024".

SEC. 3. TRAINING AND EDUCATION.

Section 303(b) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40722(b)) is amended by striking "2015 through 2019" and inserting "2019 through 2024".

SEC. 4. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM GRANTS.

Section 304(d) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(d)) is amended by striking "2015 through 2019" and inserting "2019 through 2024".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 440—DESIGNATING APRIL 2018 AS "SECOND CHANCE MONTH"

Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 440

Whereas every individual is endowed with human dignity and value;

Whereas redemption and second chances are values of the United States;

Whereas millions of individuals in the United States have a criminal record;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of individuals return to their communities from Federal and State prisons every year;

Whereas returning individuals have paid their debt after committing a crime but still

face significant legal and societal barriers (referred to in this preamble as “collateral consequences”);

Whereas collateral consequences are mandatory and take effect automatically, regardless of—

- (1) a nexus to public safety;
- (2) the seriousness of the offense;
- (3) the time passed since the offense; or
- (4) the efforts of the individual to make amends or earn back the trust of the public;

Whereas gaining meaningful employment is 1 of the most significant predictors of successful reentry and reducing future criminal activity;

Whereas many individuals who have previously been incarcerated struggle to find employment because of collateral consequences which are often not directly related to the offense committed or any proven public safety benefit;

Whereas many States have laws which prohibit an individual with a criminal record from working in certain industries or obtaining professional licenses;

Whereas education has also been shown to be a significant predictor of successful reentry;

Whereas an individual with a criminal record often has a lower level of educational attainment than the general population and has significant difficulty acquiring admission to and funding for educational programs;

Whereas an individual convicted of certain crimes is often barred from receiving the financial aid necessary to acquire additional skills and knowledge;

Whereas an individual with a criminal record also often faces collateral consequences in securing a place to live;

Whereas an individual with a criminal record is often barred from seeking access to public housing;

Whereas an individual with a criminal record also often faces other collateral consequences, such as an inability to regain voting rights, volunteer in the community, and secure identification documentation;

Whereas an individual with a criminal record may incur significant debt as a result of conviction and incarceration of the individual;

Whereas collateral consequences prevent millions of individuals in the United States from contributing fully to their families and communities;

Whereas collateral consequences can contribute to recidivism, which increases crime and victimization and decreases public safety;

Whereas the inability to find gainful employment and other collateral consequences of conviction inhibit the economic mobility of an individual with a criminal record, which can negatively impact the well-being of the children and the families of the individual for generations;

Whereas the President in the 2018 State of the Union address expressed that, “As America regains its strength, this opportunity must be extended to all citizens. That is why this year we will embark on reforming our prisons to help former inmates who have served their time get a second chance at life”;

Whereas April 9, 2018, marks the 10-year anniversary of the passage of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-199; 122 Stat. 657), which has provided reentry services to over 166,000 individuals in 49 States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas the anniversary of the death of Charles Colson, who used his second chance following his incarceration for a Watergate-related crime to found Prison Fellowship, the largest outreach program to prisoners,

former prisoners, and their families in the United States, falls on April 21; and

Whereas the designation of April as “Second Chance Month” can contribute to increased public awareness about the impact of collateral consequences, the need for closure for those who have paid their debt, and opportunities for individuals, employers, congregations, and communities to extend second chances: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2018 as “Second Chance Month”;

(2) honors the work of communities, governmental institutions, nonprofit organizations, congregations, employers, and individuals to remove unnecessary legal and societal barriers that prevent an individual with a criminal record from becoming a productive member of society; and

(3) calls upon the people of the United States to observe Second Chance Month through actions and programs that promote awareness of those unnecessary legal and social barriers and provide closure for individuals with a criminal record who have paid their debt.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORKER. Mr President, I have 9 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10:10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: John J. Bartrum, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Secretary, and Lynn A. Johnson, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, both of the Department of Health and Human Services.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “The Need to Reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.”

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during

the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION, PRODUCT SAFETY, INSURANCE, AND DATA SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Update on NHTSA and Automaker Efforts to Repair Defective Takata Air Bag Inflators.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 434 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 434) recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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. 434) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 14, 2018, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ENSURING THAT THE REQUIREMENTS THAT NEW FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES ARE PROVIDED LEAVE FOR PURPOSES OF UNDERGOING MEDICAL TREATMENT FOR SUCH DISABILITIES APPLY TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 899 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 bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 899) to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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 (S. 899) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:
S. 899

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

SECTION 1. APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LEAVE POLICY FOR DISABLED VETERANS TO EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION AND RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING LEAVE TRANSFER PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 74 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 7423 the following new section:

“§ 7423A. Personnel administration: leave

“(a) LEAVE TRANSFER PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary shall establish a leave transfer program for the benefit of health-care professionals in positions listed in section 7401(1) of this title. The Secretary may also establish a leave bank program for the benefit of such health-care professionals.

“(2) To the maximum extent feasible—

“(A) the leave transfer program shall provide the same or similar requirements and conditions as are provided for the program established by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under subchapter III of chapter 63 of title 5; and

“(B) any leave bank program established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be consistent with the requirements and conditions provided for agency leave bank programs in subchapter IV of such chapter.

“(3) Participation by a health-care professional in the leave transfer program established pursuant to paragraph (1), and in any leave bank program established pursuant to such paragraph, shall be voluntary. The Secretary may not require any health-care professional to participate in such a program.

“(4)(A) The Secretary and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may enter into an agreement that permits health-care professionals referred to in paragraph (1) to participate in the leave transfer program established by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under subchapter III of chapter 63 of title 5 or in any leave bank program established for other employees of the Department pursuant to subchapter IV of chapter 63 of title 5, or both.

“(B) Participation of such health-care professionals in a leave transfer program or a leave bank program pursuant to an agreement entered into under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed in such agreement.

“(5) The Secretary is not required to establish a leave transfer program for any personnel permitted to participate in a leave transfer program pursuant to an agreement referred to in paragraph (4).

“(b) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LEAVE POLICY FOR DISABLED VETERANS.—Section 6329 of title 5 shall apply to all health-care professionals in positions listed in section 7401(1) of this title.”.

(b) REPEAL OF TRANSFERRED AUTHORITY.—Section 7423 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 74 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7423 the following new item:

“7423A. Personnel administration: leave.”.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Wednesday, March 21; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1865, as under the previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:26 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MIKE POMPEO, OF KANSAS, TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE REX W. TILLERSON.

STEPHEN AKARD, OF INDIANA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE GENTRY O. SMITH, RESIGNED.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SHARON PAST GUSTAFSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE P. DAVID LOPEZ, RESIGNED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RONNY L. JACKSON

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 20, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

WILLIAM M. MCSWAIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

MATTHEW D. HARRIS, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JOHNNY LEE KUHLMAN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JOSEPH D. MCCLAIN, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DAVID A. WEAVER, OF COLORADO, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on March 20, 2018 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

STEPHEN AKARD, OF INDIANA, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE, VICE ARNOLD A. CHACON, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 8, 2018.

JOHNATHAN MILLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE LINDA I. ETIM, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 18, 2018.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN
MARCY KAPTUR

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise in honor of my very dear friend and sister in arms, MARCY KAPTUR, who becomes the longest serving woman in the United States House of Representatives on Sunday.

MARCY KAPTUR is a woman who has fought for working people her entire career. She has been a bulwark of support for fair trade that grows American jobs—on NAFTA in the 1990s to today, and on the Trans Pacific Partnership.

MARCY was the ranking Member on the Agriculture before I became the chair, and on issues as wide ranging as food stamps, housing, and manufacturing, she has proven time and again to be one of the brightest, most substantive colleagues I have ever worked with.

Her election paved the way for so many women to run for office. From the Carter Administration to one of the most senior members of the Congress, MARCY, your career has been exemplary of the call of public service.

Shirley Chisholm, the first African American woman in the Congress, once said: “You don’t make progress by standing on the sidelines, whimpering and complaining. You make progress by implementing ideas.” MARCY does that—she has never spent a day on the sidelines in her life.

Congratulations, and here is to many more years fighting together—for the vulnerable, for families, and for the middle class.

RECOGNIZING PROCTOR & GAMBLE
AND MATTHEW 25: MINISTRIES

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Proctor & Gamble and Matthew 25: Ministries for their efforts to help the flood victims in southern and southwest Ohio.

Much of my district in the Ohio River Valley faced widespread damage from flood waters. Following heavy winter rains, the Ohio River surged to its highest level in over two decades. The river that serves as the namesake and lifeblood my state endangered many of the communities along the river bank.

I’m grateful to all those who answered the call to serve: our law enforcement officers, first responders, and state and local government officials, who led the efforts to contain damage and begin the relief efforts.

In southern Ohio, we have been blessed to have volunteer organizations and private citizens who have come to the aid of flood vic-

tims, and who know how to be most helpful. In this, Proctor & Gamble and Matthew 25: Ministries are outstanding examples of private partners uniting their resources to provide immediate relief in their communities.

From personal care to cleaning supplies and laundry services, Proctor & Gamble’s donated products were an invaluable help to those displaced by, or battling, flooding. Matthew 25: Ministries has been a local leader, offering critical support to victims and disaster relief volunteers.

Matthew 25: Ministries and Proctor & Gamble were among the only entities to respond to the disaster in their communities. Dan, a flood victim just across the river in Kentucky, said that when he received a Proctor & Gamble bag with a handwritten note inside, he “realized that someone cared about me when I had nothing.”

Proctor & Gamble and Matthew 25: Ministries didn’t have to be there, but they were. They are an example of the strong and generous spirit of the people of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, these two organizations have demonstrated that they are truly good neighbors and good citizens. On behalf of the House of Representatives, I’d like to thank P&G and Matthew 25: Ministries for coming to the aid of flood victims in southern and southwest Ohio.

HONORING SPENCER COLE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Spencer Cole. Spencer is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 255, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Spencer has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Spencer has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Spencer has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Spencer built an educational birdhouse display for the Burroughs Audubon Nature Center in Jackson County.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Spencer for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

JING-MEI FILLMORE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jing-Mei Fillmore for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jing-Mei Fillmore is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jing-Mei Fillmore is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jing-Mei Fillmore for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THOMAS A. DAVIS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thomas A. (Tad) Davis on the occasion of his 80th birthday. Tad was born in Birmingham, Alabama on March 20, 1938, and grew up in Jacksonville, Florida where his family was in the restaurant business. A lifelong Gator fan, Tad left Jacksonville to attend the University of Florida. There he earned Bachelor of Arts and Doctor of Jurisprudence degrees, and later served on the Board of Trustees of the University of Florida Levin College of Law. He received his LL.M. in Taxation from the Georgetown University Law Center.

Tad’s first post in Washington, D.C. was with the U.S. Army serving as a Strategic Intelligence Officer with the Defense Intelligence Agency. Following his Army career, he was an attorney in the Chief Counsel’s office of the Internal Revenue Service. It was there that he became an expert in the taxation of life insurance products and companies, a specialty that still anchors the legal and legislative practices of Davis & Harman LLP, the firm he founded in 1985 with William Harman.

Tad, however, did not limit his tax expertise to life insurance. His detailed knowledge of the law extends to legislative and regulatory issues in the areas of tax, financial markets, and agricultural policy. His expertise on tax issues relating to the horse industry is widely recognized, and he is the author of the Horse Owners and Breeders Tax Handbook, the leading authority on these issues. Over the

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

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

years, the Kentucky Delegation and the equine industry have been very fortunate to benefit from his thorough understanding of this important area of the tax code. Most recently, Tad was recognized for his leadership in the successful effort to update arcane tax rules affecting withholding and reporting of pari-mutuel winnings.

Throughout a career that has spanned six decades, Tad has been known for his extraordinary tax and legislative expertise. But more importantly, he is known for his honesty, integrity, and loyalty to his friends. It is my honor to join Tad's children Denra and Reilly, his wife Jerri, his colleagues at Davis & Harman, and his many, many friends in wishing him a very happy 80th birthday.

HONORING CLINTON COUNTY FIRE-FIGHTER'S ASSOCIATION ON ITS 70TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Clinton County Firefighter's Association on its 70th anniversary.

The Clinton County Firefighter's Association and Mutual Aid System were established by Fire Chief Levi Todriff of the Chazy Fire Department with their first meeting taking place on July 18, 1948. Clinton County's Mutual Aid System is proud to be the only Mutual Aid System in the United States that is inter-county, inter-state, and international, as it spans not only throughout upstate New York, but also to Vermont and Canada.

For 70 years, firefighters and other first responders throughout the region have been risking their lives to protect their communities. They have battled large fires, some in subzero temperatures, aided in flooding relief efforts, and saved both people and livestock.

In my district, we are proud of our first responders and respect the sacrifices that they make to ensure our communities are safe. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to thank the Clinton County Firefighter's Association for its dedication to serving Clinton County and beyond. Our courageous firefighters have provided a crucial service for the past 70 years, and I look forward to hearing about their success in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during roll call vote numbers 115 and 116 on March 19, 2018, because of a death in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: on roll call vote no. 115 I would have voted YES, and on roll call vote no. 116 I would have voted YES.

JULIA GABALDON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Julia Gabaldon for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Julia Gabaldon is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Julia Gabaldon is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Julia Gabaldon for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CITY OF ORANGE 130TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MIMI WALTERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise today in recognition of the 130th Anniversary of the City of Orange, California.

Incorporated on April 6, 1888, Orange was once home to a population of less than 1,000 people.

Since then, it has become home to world-class institutions and award-winning schools.

The Children's Hospital of Orange County and UC Irvine Medical Center are located in Orange, where they serve the local community and families throughout Southern California.

It also boasts 25 Gold Ribbon schools with a nearly 98 percent graduation rate.

Much has changed over the last 130 years, yet Old Towne Orange remains a living time capsule of this community's humble beginnings.

As the antique capital of Southern California, thousands of visitors come each year to see the plaza's traditional architecture and enjoy one of the best Main Streets in the Nation.

Thanks to the hard work and dedication of the community members who live there, the City of Orange has preserved its unique charm and has rightfully earned its place in the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Speaker, Orange is an invaluable cornerstone of Orange County and an important economic driver for our region.

It is with great pleasure that I congratulate the City of Orange on its 130th anniversary.

THE AMAZING KLEIN HIGH ORCHESTRA

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the sound of beautiful music filled the air at the Alice Tully Hall at Lincoln Center in New York City. The orchestra playing? None other than the Klein High School Orchestra. The kids who make up the orchestra are some of the best in the nation and we are proud to say they hail from Houston, Texas.

The Klein High Orchestra was in New York City to compete in a nationally recognized competition, rightly named the National Orchestra Championships. The orchestra, comprised of 35 students, took home the grand prize, earning the title of the 2018 National Orchestra Cup Grand Champions. This was the first time Klein High participated at this competition and more impressively, the first for the entire school district.

The orchestra was competing against seven other schools and several of the groups were from high achieving, performance arts magnet schools. This is a remarkable feat for a talented group of young adults. The Grammy Foundation has also recognized the Music Department twice as a Grammy Signature School and all of the orchestras have earned UIL sweepstakes awards. The Klein High Orchestras have performed in the San Antonio Showcase, South Coast Music Festival, Mid-West International Band and Orchestra Clinic in Chicago Invitation at Carnegie Hall, the Circle of Honor series in Chicago at Symphony Hall and have been named Grand Champions several times at the Festival Disney Honors.

Perhaps most impressive, is the dedication and time each student poured into practice, rehearsing song after song, to ensure each note was tuned to perfection. In order to achieve perfect harmony, genuine connections need to be strung between each musician and it's evident that was achieved seamlessly.

Of course, in order to lead a great group of students, you must have a remarkable leader. Orchestra Director, Creston Herron, is to be applauded for his work and contribution to producing an extraordinary group of students.

The Klein High Orchestra has achieved incredible accolades throughout the years, but being named the champion at the National Orchestra Championships could be their crowning jewel. We are honored to represent Klein High School in Washington, D.C. and we are even more proud to say they are from the Lone Star State.

And that's just the way it is.

ANGEL GILLOTTE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Angel Gillette for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Angel Gillette is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Angel Gillotte is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Angel Gillotte for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call votes 115 and 116 on Monday, March 19, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call votes 115 and 116.

IN RECOGNITION OF MIKE
NUSSMAN ON HIS RETIREMENT
FROM THE AMERICAN
SPORTFISHING ASSOCIATION

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, sportfishing provides outdoor recreation for more than 47 million Americans each year. In Virginia, we are blessed with some of the best fishing opportunities in the nation. From fishing for striped bass on the Chesapeake Bay, to fly fishing for trout in the Blue Ridge, to throwing beetle spins for smallmouth bass on the Shenandoah and Potomac Rivers, to chasing Cobia and Tuna off Virginia Beach—we have great waters and angling throughout our state. Fishing provides opportunities for youth and families to get into the great outdoors and enjoy our public lands and waters.

Like many outdoor industries, sportfishing is often overlooked as a significant job generator and economic engine. Nationwide, it is estimated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that recreational fishing generates \$48 billion in retail sales, \$115 billion in total economic activity and 828,000 jobs.

I should note that in 2016 Congress passed the Outdoor Recreation Jobs and Economic Impact Act—The REC Act. In 2018, for the first time the U.S. Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis included outdoor recreation's impact, including fishing and boating, in our nation's Gross Domestic Product.

Maybe the most important aspect of recreational fishing is that sportfishing manufacturers, anglers and boaters pay for most of state fish and wildlife agencies fisheries conservation and boating programs.

Through special federal excise and fishing license sales, anglers and boaters are providing more than \$1.2 billion a year in funds that are allocated to the states. As a member of our Committee on Natural Resources, I'm

well aware that sportsmen and women pay a large part of the bill rather than the U.S. Treasury.

Much of this is due to the leadership of J. Michael "Mike" Nussman, president and CEO of the American Sportfishing Association (ASA), the trade association that represents the recreational fishing industry.

Since 1993, Mike has served with distinction first as head of ASA's Government Affairs program then as President and CEO. While ASA has been a trade association since 1933, it has really been in the past 25 years that the organization has assumed a leadership role for not only manufacturers of rods, reels, lures, flies, waders and related apparel, but now for the overall fishing community. I might note with some pride that ASA is headquartered in Alexandria, VA.

With the leadership of former House members such as John Dingell and John Breaux and with the support of ASA, the excise taxes I mentioned have been expanded to cover programs such as wetlands restoration, boating safety and infrastructure and the establishment of the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation (RBFF).

In fact, Mike Nussman led the effort to establish RBFF to turn around a decline in recreational fishing which started to appear in the 1990s. The most recent USFWS data indicates an upward trend in recreational fishing including more diverse and urban communities.

Mike Nussman's success should come as no surprise. He worked for the Commerce Committee and Chairman Fritz Hollings of South Carolina over in the other body. Mike was the lead professional staff for the Subcommittee that oversees fisheries policy, NOAA and the Coast Guard. Prior to that he worked for the South Carolina Sea Grant program, earning undergraduate and graduate degrees in science, and an MBA from the University of South Carolina.

Mr. Nussman's tenure at ASA improved the 'business side' of his trade association. The sportfishing industry's annual trade show is now the largest in the world. His leadership made the organization financially strong, helping weather it through economic downturns.

He has served on numerous boards of directors and advisory groups from the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, to Blue Ribbon Panel on Sustaining America's Diverse Fish & Wildlife Resources. He also found time to serve as a United States Commissioner on the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas.

Mike Nussman brought special expertise as a former Senate staffer to the recreational fishing industry and the conservation community. So, I think it's appropriate that he be recognized today for a job well done. Anglers and businesses across this nation can be thankful that he was at the helm.

CASSANDRA GIST

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cassandra Gist for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Cassandra Gist is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cassandra Gist is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cassandra Gist for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

DESIGNATING THE U.S. POSTAL
OFFICE AT 1320 AUTUMN AVE.
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE AS THE
"JUDGE RUSSELL B. SUGARMON
POST OFFICE"

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill I introduced today to designate the U.S. Postal Office at 1320 Autumn Ave. Memphis, Tennessee as the "Judge Russell B. Sugarmon Post Office."

Born in Memphis, Tennessee in 1929, Judge Russell B. Sugarmon is heralded for his contributions to the City of Memphis and his work to reverse the tide of racism in Tennessee, paving the way for future black leaders in the area and inspiring their efforts to increase their representation in elected, Democratic bodies.

In 1959, Russell Sugarmon became the first African-American in Memphis to run for a major city office when he ran for Public Works Commissioner. Sugarmon's tenacity to overcome racial opposition to his candidacy paved the way and inspired other African-Americans in Memphis to seek public office. In 1966, he was elected to the Tennessee General Assembly, becoming the second African-American in Tennessee to be elected to the Assembly post Reconstruction. From 1976 to 1987, Sugarmon was a Referee in the Memphis Juvenile Court System before being appointed to serve as a judge for the General Sessions court. Judge Sugarmon was subsequently elected and re-elected to the bench and held his seat for 20 years until his retirement in 2006.

Working alongside notable Memphis pioneers and leaders in the fight for racial justice and equality, Judge Sugarmon was instrumental in using the courts to desegregate public transportation, restaurants and public facilities and the desegregation of Memphis public schools. Both the NAACP and ACLU have honored Judge Sugarmon for his contributions to Memphis. He was most recently awarded the 2014 Be the Dream MLK Legacy Award.

As a trailblazer for African-American stewardship in public office and a leader in the Civil Rights Movement, it is only fitting that we enshrine our recognition of his contributions to the City of Memphis and the African American community by naming the 1320 Autumn Ave. Post Office in Memphis, TN in honor of his legacy.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure in honoring Judge Russell B. Sugarmon, an exemplary American and titan of his time.

IN HONOR OF MR. TOGO DENNIS
WEST, JR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding leader and dear friend of longstanding, Togo Dennis West, Jr. Sadly, Togo passed away on Thursday, March 8, 2018. A funeral service will be held on Tuesday, April 24, 2018 at 2 p.m. at the Washington National Cathedral in Washington, D.C.

Togo D. West, Jr. was born to Togo D. West, Sr. and Evelyn E. Carter West in Winston-Salem, North Carolina on June 21, 1942. He graduated from Akins High School in 1965 as valedictorian, was a member of the National Honor Society, and an Eagle Scout with Bronze Palm. He earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Engineering and a Juris Doctorate degree from Howard University, where he graduated first in his law school class in 1968.

In 1969, he entered the United States Army as a Commissioned Officer in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. He also served as a staffer in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs for four years.

In 1975, Togo was appointed Associate Deputy Attorney General by President Ford. He then served in several capacities in President Carter's administration including General Counsel to the Department of the Navy from 1977 to 1979; Special Assistant to both the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1979; and General Counsel to the United States Department of Defense from 1980 to 1981. In 1993, President Bill Clinton appointed him the United States Secretary of the Army. As the second African-American to serve in this position, Togo oversaw the transition of the Army from a post-Cold War organization to a contemporary fighting force. He also was the driving force behind initiatives that granted women more opportunities to serve within the ranks and a strong advocate for harsher penalties for sexual misconduct. In 1998, President Clinton appointed him Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs. During his tenure, he was a strong advocate for increased funding for veterans medical care and benefits.

Outside of his government service, Togo was also actively involved in the community. He presided on a variety of boards and served in a number of organizations at the local, state, and national levels. Over the course of his life, he received numerous awards and commendations, including the Legion of Merit and the Meritorious Service Medal; Distinguished Eagle Scout in 1995; and the Silver Buffalo Award and the Silver Beaver Award.

George Washington Carver once said, "No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it." We are all so blessed that Togo West, Jr. passed this way and during his life's

journey did so much for so many for so long. His leadership, his counsel, and his prominent presence will be greatly missed.

Togo is survived by his loving wife, Gail; his two daughters, Tiffany and Hilary; two wonderful grandchildren; and a host of other family members and friends.

On a personal note, the West family shares a special relationship with the Bishop family. My wife, Vivian, Togo's wife, Gail, and Hilary shared membership in the Metropolitan D.C. Chapter of The Links, Inc. Togo and I are both Eagle Scouts and share the honor of having been named Distinguished Eagle Scouts by the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America. Moreover, Hilary served as valued member of our congressional staff in Washington as she started her career ascension in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, the members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, along with the more than 730,000 people of the Second Congressional District, honor and salute Togo West, Jr. for his outstanding achievements, service, and public distinction. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest condolences to his family and friends during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith in the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

GOLFER AND SPECIAL OLYMPIAN,
SHAUN LINSEY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on any beautiful day down in Houston, Texas, you can find Shaun Linsey driving perfectly hit golf balls down the range. His father, Mark, is Shaun's biggest fan and competitor. Mark and Shaun have competitions between the two from time to time, but it's always in good fun.

At age three, Shaun's parents were told he was autistic and that he wouldn't ever be able to speak. Shaun has defied the odds, and with the help of his mom, Linda, Shaun is able to both speak and compete in the sport he loves.

Shaun has since picked up the game of golf and has become wildly successful. Even though his golf skills were impeccable, Shaun found he wasn't accepted in regular competitions. That's when he and his family turned toward the Special Olympics. The great program gave the young golfer a chance to compete and win. Shaun has done more than just compete in golf competitions. He and his dad have won area, state, and even placed in national competitions.

Shaun is one of the best golfers around, and that's a true testament to his determination in continually striving to better himself. Becoming a great golfer takes a lot of hard work and it is evident Shaun has put in many hours on the golf course to get to where he is today.

I am honored to be able to speak of Shaun's accomplishments in his life. I am also honored to say Shaun hails from our beloved Houston. His tenacity and passion for life is incredible and he truly exemplifies what it means to be a Special Olympian.

Keep golfing Shaun. We can't wait to see what else he accomplishes down the road. And that's just the way it is.

CHARITY GRIMSLEY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Charity Grimsley for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Charity Grimsley is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Charity Grimsley is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Charity Grimsley for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 2018 I missed a Roll Call vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" No. 105.

CONGRATULATING BAKER'S
CREEK BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Baker's Creek Baptist Church in Eureka, Indiana for 200 years of service and fellowship in Southwest Indiana.

Dating back to 1818, the Baker's Creek Baptist Church is the second oldest church in Spencer County. It has served not just as a place of worship, but also as a refuge for those in times of trouble and means of encouragement for men and women of faith, including influential Americans such as President Abraham Lincoln.

Through the Lord's grace and the devotion of leaders like Pastor James Carl Jones, Baker's Creek Baptist Church has remained a place for the congregation to worship and come together as a community.

I am grateful for Baker's Creek Baptist Church's rich history of service over the past 200 years and excited for what the future holds. Again, congratulations on achieving this tremendous milestone.

ALISON HOWARD

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alison Howard for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Alison Howard is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alison Howard is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alison Howard for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF BENJAMIN FERENCZ

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I along with Representative DEUTCH, am pleased to honor Benjamin Ferencz, an investigator of Nazi war crimes following World War II and the chief prosecutor for the United States at the Einsatzgruppen trial at Nuremberg.

Benjamin was born in Somcuta Mare, a village in Romania, and emigrated to the United States with his family when he was 10 months old. He attended Harvard Law School and joined the Army following his studies. Assigned to General Patton's Third Army, he was tasked with gathering evidence of the Nazi's war crimes. After the war he was named the chief prosecutor for the United States in one of the Nuremberg Trials, at only 27 years old, and his prosecution resulted in 22 convictions. Mr. Ferencz became a global advocate for the establishment of an international rule of law and the International Criminal Court, and served as an adjunct professor of international law at Pace University in New York.

Benjamin has contributed immeasurably to the international rule of law and his service to our country and the world is worthy of great recognition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A TRIBUTE TO JOYE E. FROST

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that we learned of the death on March 12, 2018 of a true advocate for crime

victims and survivors. For most of her professional career, Joye Frost served crime victims through her efforts at the U.S. Department of Justice's Office for Victims of Crime (OVC), our nation's premiere agency dedicated to serving and advocating on behalf of victims of all types of crimes.

Joye Frost began her career as a Child Protective Services caseworker in South Texas and has worked in the victim assistance, healthcare, and disability advocacy fields for more than 30 years in the U.S. and Europe, including several years working at the community and headquarters levels for the Department of Army.

In January 2009, Joye was designated Acting Director of OVC and made the permanent Director in 2013. She was a strong and consistent advocate for the Crime Victims Fund, and developed a very close working relationship with state VOCA assistance and crime victim compensation program managers.

Perhaps her most profound and long-lasting legacy will be her inspiration and leadership encompassed by her landmark achievement: the development and implementation of Vision 21: Transforming Victim Services. Joye's nationwide initiative successfully sought to expand the reach and impact of the victim assistance field; recognize the role of victims in the nation's response to crime and delinquency; identify emerging and enduring challenges in the victims' field; and address the need to build the capacity of victim service providers to meet those challenges. Today and in the future, Vision 21 remains the "blueprint" for comprehensive, quality victim/survivor services nationwide.

She began her working on special projects at OVC in 1997 and, since 2001, directed OVC's annual observance of National Crime Victims' Rights Week, including its National Service Awards and the NCVRW Community Awareness Projects. As the Principal Associate Director for OVC, she developed national scope training, technical assistance and other resources to help crime victims, including the development of the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) and Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) training and technical assistance project, as well as projects to help crime victims with disabilities. She also implemented grant programs to support comprehensive services for victims of human trafficking.

The U.S. Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus, founded by Representative JIM COSTA (CA) and me, recognizes that with Joye Frost's passing, crime victims have lost a strong and outspoken advocate. We have worked closely with Joye to improve the lives of victims for many years, and know that her positive and profound impact on the profession of crime victim/survivor services will endure far into the future.

And that's just the way it is.

KARMA JAMES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Karma James for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Karma James is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Karma James is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Karma James for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING BENJAMIN DANIEL GRAVES

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Benjamin Daniel Graves. Ben is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 714, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Ben has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Ben has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Ben has become a Firebuilder in the Tribe of Mic-0-Say while also attending High Adventure at Philmont Scout Ranch and participating in the Peak Scout Camp in Derbyshire, England. As part of the Peak Scout Camp exchange, Ben was able to visit London and Scotland and in return hosted two English Scouts in the summer of 2017. Ben has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Ben cleaned up the park, mulched the landscaping, and repainted the bandstand the Veterans Memorial Park in Edgerton, Missouri.

As Ben's uncle, I am proud of the young man he has become. As an Eagle Scout, I admire the determination he has shown in completing his path to Eagle.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Benjamin Daniel Graves for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING DR. DENNIS FRISCH

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Dr. Dennis Frisch and his induction as the President of the American Podiatric Medical Association.

Dr. Frisch has dedicated his life to serving both his profession and his community.

Dr. Frisch began serving on the American Podiatric Medical Association (APMA) Board

of Trustees in 2007 and has served on multiple APMA committees during this time. Before being elected to the APMA Board, Dr. Frisch served at all levels of leadership in the Florida Podiatric Medical Association (FPMA), culminating with his presidency from 1995–1996. He was honored by the FPMA in 2005 when he received the Florida Podiatric Physician of the Year Award for his many years of service.

Dr. Frisch is also very active in the Boca Raton Rotary Club and has served 2 separate terms as president. He volunteered with a variety of youth sports organizations and served for 8 years as a Commissioner for the Greater Boca Raton Beach and Parks District. He is currently an appointed Board member to the City of Boca Raton Parks and Recreation Department Advisory Board.

Today I ask this body to recognize Dr. Frisch as he assumes his new role as President of the American Podiatric Medical Association.

Dr. Frisch exemplifies the hard work and dedication that I see throughout Palm Beach County and the State of Florida. I thank him for his service and congratulate him for this accomplishment.

KAYLA McNIERNEY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kayla McNierney for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kayla McNierney is a student at Warren Tech North and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kayla McNierney is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kayla McNierney for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CLARIFY CERTAIN DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SERVING IN SENSITIVE POSITIONS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, as hundreds of thousands of our federal workers face uncertainty in wages and work, I rise along with my House colleagues ROBERT J. WITTMAN and ANDRÉ CARSON to introduce a bill to clarify certain due process rights of federal employees serving in sensitive positions. Our bill

would overturn an unprecedented federal court decision, *Kaplan v. Conyers and MSPB*, which stripped many federal employees of the right to independent review of an agency decision removing them from a job on grounds of ineligibility. The case was brought by two Department of Defense (DOD) employees, Rhonda Conyers, an accounting technician, and Devon Northover, a commissary management specialist, who were permanently demoted and suspended from their jobs after they were found no longer to be eligible to serve in noncritical sensitive positions. In 2014, the Supreme Court declined to hear the case, which allowed the appeals court decision to stand.

Specifically, the decision prevents federal workers who are designated as “noncritical sensitive” from appealing to the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) if they are removed from their jobs. Noncritical sensitive jobs include those that do not have access to classified information. The decision would affect at least 200,000 DOD employees who are designated as noncritical sensitive. Even more seriously, most federal employees could potentially lose the same right to an independent review of an agency’s decision because of a rule by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), which went into effect in July 2015, that permits agency heads to designate most jobs in the federal government as noncritical sensitive.

The Kaplan decision undercuts Title 5, section 7701 of the Civil Service Act, which ensures due process rights for federal workers required by the U.S. Constitution. Stripping employees whose work does not involve classified matters of the right of review of an agency decision that removes them from their jobs opens entirely new avenues for unreviewable, arbitrary action or retaliation by an agency head and, in addition, makes a mockery of whistleblower protections enacted in the 112th Congress. Our bill would stop the use of “national security” to repeal a vital component of civil service protection and of due process.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

IN HONOR OF THE SPRING FIRE DEPARTMENT’S 65TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women of the Spring Fire Department. For 65 years, Spring firefighters have run in where we run out.

On April 29, 1953, seven people bound together with donated fire apparatus to form the Spring Volunteer Fire Department approximately 22 miles north of downtown Houston. Local residents and businesses made donations to fund the department for its first three decades.

As the department celebrated its 30th anniversary, the volunteers worked to form the Harris County Rural Fire Prevention District No. 1 (HCRFPD). For the first time, the Spring Volunteer Fire Department began receiving tax dollars to help build fire stations, buy equipment and train volunteers.

On Texas Independence Day in 1985, the Spring Fire Department suffered its only line-of-duty loss. District Chief Michael F. West died battling a 2-Alarm fire near Old Town Spring. His sacrifice is immortalized in bronze in front of the Spring Fire Department Administration building.

As the population grew, the Spring Fire Department continued to evolve. During the 1990’s, as Emergency Services Districts (ESD) began forming to provide stable funding for emergency services in the unincorporated areas of Texas counties, Harris County ESD No. 7 replaced the outdated HCRFPD No. 1.

In 1997, the Spring Volunteer Fire Department hired its first part-time firefighters to staff an apparatus during business hours. Widely known as the duty crew, they responded to calls during the day when most volunteers were at work. As the population and staffing needs continued to grow, the department further evolved.

In 2013, the department’s first fulltime firefighters joined the Spring fire family. With a combination of fulltime, part-time, and volunteer firefighters, the decision was made to change the name to the Spring Fire Department (SFD).

Operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, today the Spring Fire Department is one of the largest combination departments in the state of Texas.

SFD covers 62 square miles of northern Harris County serving an estimated population of 152,000 people. SFD’s nine fire stations house a fleet of 25 pieces of fire and rescue apparatus along with 15 support vehicles. The Spring Fire Department is under the leadership of Fire Chief Scott Seifert and today we celebrate their 65 years of dedicated service to the Spring community.

And that is just the way it is.

KALEIGH MELINGER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kaleigh Melinger for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kaleigh Melinger is a student at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kaleigh Melinger is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kaleigh Melinger for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, this week I missed two roll calls. Had I been present I would have voted: Roll Call No. 115—Yes, and Roll Call No. 116—Yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 19, 2018, I was absent from the House Chamber during roll call vote 115. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

HONORING JUSTINE LEE SNYDER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Justin Lee Snyder. Justin is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1028, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Justin has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Justin has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Justin has become a member of the tribe Mic-O-Say. Justin has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Justin designed a wall to enclose the HVAC unit at his church where the Scout troop meets. He raised the funds with help from the Knights of Columbus, and organized a group of volunteers to build the enclosure.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Justin for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

BROOKE MILLER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Brooke Miller for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Brooke Miller is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Brooke Miller is exemplary of the type of achievement

that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Brooke Miller for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING PETER G. DAUSEN

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and character of a great American on the occasion of his retirement from civilian service with the United States Navy. Peter G. Dausen, or simply Pete as he is known to all, has given his entire adult life to the service of his family and country. He has set a towering example to all of us fortunate to know him. As Pete steps down from the position of Deputy and Technical Director for the Naval Support Activity Monterey, we all know that his influence has reached far beyond the strict confines of the job title.

Pete graduated from Kent State University in 1974 and commissioned as a Second Lieutenant into the United States Army. He served in uniform for nearly 30 years as a signals officer with tours of duty across the United States and abroad. He oversaw signals operations in Somalia during the 1993 Battle of Mogadishu. He served as a peace keeper in Bosnia. He led soldiers and mentored young officer and NCOs. Along the way he earned two Masters Degrees and graduated from the Army War College, in Strategic Studies. Upon promotion to Colonel, Pete came to the Monterey Peninsula to serve as the Garrison Commander Presidio of Monterey, home of the Defense Language Institute and Ord Military Community. Although at first Pete was reticent to shift from warrior to city manager, he excelled in this last Army command.

Upon retirement from active duty at the conclusion of his Garrison Command, Pete transitioned into the civilian position managing the facilities for the Naval Postgraduate School also located in Monterey. This role, which grew into the fully fledged Naval Support Activity Monterey during his tenure, became vital to the success of the military missions located in Monterey. He successfully advocated for new investments in the facilities at the NPS, the Fleet Numerical Meteorological and Oceanographic Center, the Navy Research Lab and the Navy War College. These efforts included helping to secure over \$212 million in MilCon funding to update and improve facilities and advance these missions. He was also instrumental in standing up the new RCI housing and strengthening MWR programs for military families. Pete takes particular pride in the new academic fence that rings the public frontage of NPS.

Pete has been a tireless advocate of the broader military mission in Monterey. He has played a vital role in the mission of TEAM Monterey, which has been crucial in advancing our national security interests by fostering

long-term, positive community relationships between military facilities and public officials. Throughout his career, Pete has been a role model for the men and women who have been lucky enough to serve under him, as exemplified by his recent selection as a recipient of the Superior Civilian Service Award.

In honor of his service, I would like to express my gratitude for Peter G. Dausen for his dedication to this country and our community. I wish him all the best and I am sure that he is looking forward to continuing his impressive portfolio of artwork, and spending time with his loving family.

RECOGNIZING THE 20TH
ANNIVERSARY OF BISCOTTI CAFE**HON. JOHN KATKO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 20th Anniversary of Biscotti Cafe in Syracuse.

Two decades ago, in March 1998, Geoff and Debbie Camire opened their bakery on Butternut Street. Soon after opening, their business flourished, and became a staple in Syracuse.

Unfortunately, just five years after opening their doors, Geoff and Debbie's business was destroyed in a fire. Despite this massive setback, Geoff and Debbie reopened their bakery and persevered. After a few years on South Geddes Street, the bakery reopened on North Salina Street in 2004, where it remains today. The cafe serves sandwiches, soups and salads for lunch. But throughout our community, the bakery is best known for its Italian and European-inspired pastries, cookies and cakes.

Twenty years later, the Camires and their staff make thousands upon thousands of pastries, cookies, and cakes each year. Businesses and business owners like these form the foundation of our economy, and provide our communities proof that the American Dream is alive and well.

I am proud to recognize the Camires and Biscotti Cafe for celebrating 20 years in business. Geoff and Debbie Camire have become an indispensable part of the Syracuse community and I wish this outstanding business continued success in the years to come.

STUDENT, TEACHERS, AND OFFICERS
PREVENTING SCHOOL VIOLENCE
ACT OF 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 2018 I missed Roll Call Vote No. 106. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes.

No other developed nation on the planet experiences gun violence with the frequency that we do in the United States. The gun homicide rate in our country is more than seven times that of Sweden, six times that of Canada, and twenty-one times that of Australia. On average, 93 Americans die every day from gun violence and 222 people are shot and survive,

including 40 children and teens. And since 1970, more Americans have been killed by guns than Americans killed in all of our nation's wars combined.

The numbers are simply staggering.

H.R. 4909 will help schools develop violence prevention strategies, strengthen school security, and help educators and law enforcement prevent students from hurting themselves or others. But Congress should be doing much more to prevent gun violence. The majority of the American people—and the majority of gun owners—want Congress to take action.

The American people deserve open floor debates or straight up or down votes on commonsense measures such as banning “bump stocks” which make guns more lethal, forming a select committee on gun violence, requiring background checks for all gun sales, and allowing the Centers for Disease Control and other federal health agencies to conduct crucial gun violence research.

Americans deserve a society that is free from the regular threat of gun violence. The status quo is unacceptable. We have a responsibility to pursue change.

RECOGNIZING CHAD AND DEB BREMMER FOR RECEIVING THE NATIONAL OUTSTANDING YOUNG FARMERS AWARD

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud to rise today, on National Ag Day, to congratulate Chad and Deb Bremmer of Pearl City, Illinois on receiving the National Outstanding Young Farmers Award.

Chad and Deb are being recognized for their great contributions to our agricultural community, and for their efforts to foster a deeper understanding of the role farmer's play in our region's economy. In addition to operating their family farm, Chad has gone above and beyond by serving on the Stephenson County Farm Bureau Board for twelve years, the Pearl City School Board for eight years and the State Young Leader Committee for four years. In addition, Deb also serves as a nurse. Their work has without a doubt invested in the future of our region, and the lives of our family farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chad and Deb for their service to better our communities. It is because of hardworking families like the Bremmers, that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. I congratulate them again on their well-earned achievement and wish them the best of luck in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROVISIONS BAKERY & RESTAURANT

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 30th anniversary of Provisions

Bakery & Restaurant, located in Armory Square in my district in Syracuse, New York.

In coordination with AccessCNY, Provisions Bakery & Restaurant operates a job training program for individuals living with disabilities in our community. The mission of Provisions is to empower all of its employees, individuals of all abilities, to work in a positive and supportive environment and gain skills needed to secure and maintain competitive employment.

In its three decades, the bakery has sold more than 200,000 of its signature chocolate chip cookies, but more importantly has positively impacted over 1,000 lives.

Provisions trainees work alongside professional staff learning all aspects of the bakery from cooking and baking, to serving and cleaning. Trainees develop employment skills such as time management, interpersonal skills and how to manage workplace expectations, which will improve their access to employment opportunities across Central New York.

Throughout the years, Provisions has become a staple in the Armory Square restaurant and business community, and I am proud to congratulate the employees of Provisions on the occasion of 30 years in business.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF NANCY ANN KUNOVICH

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Nancy Ann Kunovich, age 82, who passed away peacefully on March 11, 2018.

Nancy was born on September 25, 1935 in Youngstown, Ohio. Nancy was married to Charles Kunovich and together they raised 5 children. In addition to being a mom, Nancy worked for the Austintown School District for over 30 years as one of the pioneers behind the “I Can” Program. Nancy's compassion and devotion throughout the program inspired countless young people to turn their lives around.

After retiring in 2005, Nancy moved to Manchaca, Texas. She enjoyed spending her retired life gardening, reading, cooking, and so much more. Her greatest pride and joy came in spending time with her family and friends. Her step-grandchildren and great-grandchildren lovingly referred to her as Grandma Nancy.

Nancy was preceded in death by her husband Charles, her daughter Elizabeth Blockinger, her parents Hannah and William Richards, and her brother William Richards, Jr. Nancy is survived by her children Glenn Johnson and wife Norma, daughter Lynda Self and husband Carl, daughter Christine Johnson; son, Eric Johnson and grandchildren Eric Betts, Kate Kam, and Hannah Blockinger. Nancy also leaves five step-children behind; Kathy Joyce and husband David, Michelle Chance and husband Joe, Charles Kunovich Jr., Mary Jo Cusack and husband Jim, Michael Kunovich and wife Michelle.

I had the pleasure of knowing Nancy's son Glenn. She was a beloved mother and grandmother, and I know she is dearly missed. I extend my deepest condolences to Glenn and his family.

SOCCKER STAR AND SPECIAL OLYMPIAN, MATT WEISER

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Matt Weiser loves nothing more than lacing up his cleats and hitting the soccer field. Matt is a skilled player and is lightning on his feet, but a few years ago, you wouldn't think that could have been possible.

When Matt was in the second grade, he started experiencing epileptic seizures. The seizures started to become so severe his parents and doctors decided it was time to perform surgery. The operation required removing part of his brain, which rendered Matt speechless and paralyzed. After many rounds of therapy and the love and care of his family, Matt performed the unimaginable. He learned how to speak and walk again. Walking turned to running, and running eventually took him back to his first love, soccer.

Matt started playing soccer when he was five. He competed in events all the way up until his surgery. After Matt learned how to walk again, he got right back on the field. His passion for soccer led to competing in the Special Olympics, which led to competing on the national stage. The Special Olympics has allowed Matt to pursue his dream of playing soccer and has been an invaluable resource to him and his family.

As soon as Matt steps onto the soccer field, his exuberance and passion for life shines through. The dedication he has shown, just to get to where he is today, is exceptional. Being able to bounce back after a life altering surgery is a true testament to Matt's determination to better himself. Of course, it wouldn't have been possible without the help of his family and his parents, John and Rebecca. Sometimes life throws you a curve ball, but how you react to it and handle it, makes all the difference.

I am honored to be able to spread Matt's inspiring story today. I am also proud to say Matt is a native of the great city of Houston, Texas. As Texans and Houstonians, we pride ourselves in hard work and Matt exemplifies that very quality. I have no doubt Matt will continue to dominate in the sport he loves and we will all be there cheering him on.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF MILDRED LESLIE'S 100TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Mildred Leslie on the celebration of her 100th birthday.

I join her friends and family in extending my best to her on this occasion and in celebrating her life and many contributions to our great state and county. I hope she uses this momentous day to do the same.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Mildred Leslie on her birthday. May her year be filled with happiness and blessings.

2018: THE YEAR OF THE BLACK WOMAN

SPEECH OF

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2018

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today during Women's History Month to honor the extraordinary accomplishments made by Black women throughout our nation's history.

In 1987, Congress declared March to be National Women's History Month, giving the nation the chance to reflect on and salute the trailblazers who paved the way for many of the rights women have today.

I am blessed to be able to stand upon the shoulders of such great Black women, who sacrificed so much to help secure equal rights for all Americans, including generations yet unborn.

Some are household names, such as Rosa Parks.

In her defiance to give up her bus seat on a Montgomery City Bus in December 1961, she sparked the peaceful 381-day Montgomery bus boycott, leading to the desegregation of our nation's public transportation systems.

There is also Shirley Chisholm who in 1968 became the first Black woman elected to Congress.

Only four years later, she became the first woman to seek the Democratic presidential nomination.

In my own state of Ohio, there is Ellen Walker Craig-Jones, the first Black woman to be elected mayor in the United States by popular vote.

Ohio also gave us Irene Long, the first female chief medical officer at the Kennedy Space Center.

These women, and so many others, helped make it possible for me to stand here, on the floor of the House of Representatives, with my fellow women of the Congressional Black Caucus.

We owe them a debt of gratitude.

But, this Women's History Month, not only should we honor the history that has been made; we should look forward, to the history that will be made.

We are so fortunate to have Black women who continue to lead the way:

Public servants like new Atlanta mayor Keisha Lance Bottoms;

Organizers and advocates like those who led the Women's March; and Patrisse Cullors, who co-founded Black Lives Matter; and Tarana Burke, who first used "Me Too" to raise awareness of the pervasiveness of sexual harassment and assault in our society.

Women continue to face workplace discrimination, a higher risk of sexual assault, and an earnings gap that will cost the average woman hundreds of thousands of dollars over the course of her working lifetime.

"Me too," a simple phrase turned hashtag, has galvanized millions into action, letting those who continue to treat women as second-class citizens know that time's up.

Countless more Black women are unknown outside of their own families and communities, but still deserve admiration:

The Black women who sent a message to this administration, by showing up in Alabama to vote in the first Democratic Senator from the state in 25 years;

The Black women who have marched and continue to do so to have their voices heard;

The Black women who will attend school and college against the odds, who will run for office, who will fight for what they believe.

All are part of our history and their courage and dedication have helped to sustain the American spirit by breaking down barriers, cre-

ating new opportunities, and inspiring the next generation.

Still, there is more work to be done to provide women with the economic security and opportunities they deserve and their families need.

We must diversify our workplaces to reflect what our communities look like.

Statistics show that companies with more racial, ethnic, and gender diversity are more likely to be successful.

When women—and in particular, women of color—are allowed to succeed, then we all succeed. That has been true throughout our nation's history.

It is my honor to celebrate Women's History Month by recognizing all those who came before me, to continue to work every day to create an even brighter future for all Americans.

IN HONOR OF WILLIAM STRAHAN'S 100TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to William Strahan on the celebration of his 100th birthday.

I join his friends and family in extending my best to him on this occasion and in celebrating his life and contributions to our great state and country. I hope he uses this momentous day to do the same.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to William Strahan on his birthday. May his year be filled with happiness and blessings.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1799–S1848

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2572–2580, and S. Res. 440. **Pages S1844–45**

Measures Reported:

S. 2325, to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–214)

S. Res. 85, calling on the Government of Iran to fulfill repeated promises of assistance in the case of Robert Levinson, the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's history, with an amendment and with an amended preamble.

S. Res. 432, congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence, with an amendment. **Page S1840**

Measures Passed:

Recognizing contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 434, recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S1847**

Veterans Health Administration employees: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 899, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, and the bill was then passed. **Page S1848**

Measures Considered:

Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 1865, to amend the Communications

Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking. **Pages S1801–13, S1813–34**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 11 a.m., on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, Senate begin consideration of the bill, as under the order of Monday, March 19, 2018. **Page S1848**

Yemen Joint Resolution: By 55 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 58), Senate tabled the motion to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations of S.J. Res. 54, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress. **Page S1827**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to extending trade authorities procedures for three years; which was referred to the Committee on Finance. (PM–32) **Pages S1836–37**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

William M. McSwain, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years.

Matthew D. Harris, of Utah, to be United States Marshal for the District of Utah for the term of four years.

Johnny Lee Kuhlman, of Oklahoma, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Oklahoma for the term of four years.

Joseph D. McClain, of Indiana, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Indiana for the term of four years.

David A. Weaver, of Colorado, to be United States Marshal for the District of Colorado for the term of four years. **Page S1848**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Mike Pompeo, of Kansas, to be Secretary of State.

Stephen Akard, of Indiana, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, with the rank of Ambassador.

Sharon Fast Gustafson, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term of four years.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Page S1848

Nominations Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nominations:

Stephen Akard, of Indiana, to be Director General of the Foreign Service, which was sent to the Senate on January 8, 2018.

Johnathan Miller, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, which was sent to the Senate on January 18, 2018.

Page S1848

Messages from the House: **Page S1837**

Measures Referred: **Page S1837**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1837–38**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S1838–39**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S1840–44**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1845–46**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S1846**

Additional Statements: **Page S1836**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1847**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—58) **Page S1827**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:26 p.m., until 11 a.m. on Wednesday, March 21, 2018. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1848.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 2,901 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States Strategic Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Gen-

eral John E. Hyten, USAF, Commander, United States Strategic Command, Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower concluded a hearing to examine Marine Corps ground modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Jimmy D. Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Expeditionary Programs and Logistics Management, and Lieutenant General Robert S. Walsh, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Combat Development and Integration, Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, and Commander, United States Marine Forces Strategic Command, both of the Department of Defense.

TAKATA AIR BAG INFLATORS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security concluded a hearing to examine an update on National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and automaker efforts to repair defective Takata air bag inflators, after receiving testimony from Heidi King, Deputy Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation; John D. Buretta, TK Holdings, Inc., New York, New York; David Kelly, Independent Testing Coalition, Springfield, Virginia; Joseph Perkins, Key Safety Systems, Inc., Sterling Heights, Michigan; Rick Schostek, Honda North America, Inc., Marysville, Ohio; and Desi Ujkashevich, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Michigan.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of Energy, after receiving testimony from Rick Perry, Secretary of Energy.

NOMINATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Alexander and Corker, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of John J. Bartrum, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Secretary, and Lynn A. Johnson, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, who was introduced by Senator Gardner, both of the Department of Health and Human Services, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. Res. 85, calling on the Government of Iran to fulfill repeated promises of assistance in the case of Robert Levinson, the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's history, with an amendment;

S. Res. 224, recognizing the 5th anniversary of the death of Oswaldo Paya Sardinias, and commemorating his legacy and commitment to democratic values and principles, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 376, urging the Governments of Burma and Bangladesh to ensure the safe, dignified, voluntary, and sustainable return of the Rohingya refugees who have been displaced by the campaign of ethnic cleansing conducted by the Burmese military, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 426, supporting the goals of International Women's Day, with an amendment;

S. Res. 429, 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;

S. Res. 432, congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence, with an amendment;

H.R. 1660, to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency;

Extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Kosovo (the "Treaty"), signed at Pristina on March 29, 2016 (Treaty Doc. 115-02);

Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Kiribati on the Delimitation of Maritime Boundaries, signed at Majuro on September 6, 2013, and the Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia on the Delimitation

of a Maritime Boundary, signed at Koror on August 1, 2014 (Treaty Doc. 114-13);

Extradition Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Serbia (the "Treaty"), signed at Belgrade on August 15, 2016 (Treaty Doc. 115-01);

United Nations Convention on the Assignment of Receivables in International Trade, done at New York on December 12, 2001, and signed by the United States on December 30, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 114-07); and

The nominations of Erik Bethel, of Florida, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Judy Lynn Shelton, of Virginia, to be United States Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Kevin Edward Moley, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Organization Affairs), Robert Frank Pence, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Finland, Trevor D. Traina, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria, Andrea L. Thompson, of South Dakota, to be Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, Marie Royce, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary (Educational and Cultural Affairs), and Edward Charles Prado, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Argentine Republic, all of the Department of State, Josephine Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the Peace Corps, and Sean Cairncross, of Minnesota, to be Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation.

REAUTHORIZING THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, including S. 2521, to authorize the issuance of extreme risk protection orders, S. 2266, to authorize the Office on Violence Against Women to improve the handling of crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by incorporating a trauma-informed approach into the initial response to and investigation of such crimes, and S. 1539, to protect victims of stalking from gun violence, after receiving testimony from Katharine T. Sullivan, Principal Deputy Director, Office on Violence Against Women, Department of Justice; Tracy M. Prior, San Diego County District Attorney's Office, San Diego, California; and Amanda Nguyen, Rise, and Cindy Dyer, Vital Voices Global Partnership, both of Washington, D.C.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intel-

ligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 21 public bills, H.R. 5336–5356, and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 791–792, were introduced. **Pages H1727–28**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H1729**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Randy K. Weber Sr. to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1701**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:07 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Dr. Michael Lewis, Roswell Street Baptist Church, Marietta, GA. **Page H1702**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1704.

Recess: The House recessed at 1:04 p.m. and reconvened at 1:40 p.m. **Page H1710**

Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act: The House passed H.R. 4566, to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide relief to nonbanks from certain stress test requirements under such Act, by a yea-and-nay vote of 395 yeas to 19 nays, Roll No. 119. **Pages H1717–18**

Agreed to:

Maxine Waters (CA) amendment No. 1, as modified, That restores the Federal Reserve Board's discretionary authority to stress test any non-designated non-bank, provided that certain conditions are met. It would also allow the Fed to use alternatives to capital, as appropriate, when stress-testing SIFI-designated non-banks, and eliminates the bill's \$10 billion threshold for the SEC's and CFTC's authority to issue stress testing rules for entities under their purview. **Page H1717**

Agreed by unanimous consent that the Waters Amendment No. 1 to the bill H.R. 4566, printed in House Report No. 115–613, be modified. **Page H1712**

Pursuant to House Resolution 787, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–65, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read. **Page H1712**

H. Res. 787, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4566 and H.R. 5247), was agreed to by recorded vote of 225 yeas to 183 noes, Roll No. 118, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 117. **Pages H1710–12**

Unanimous Consent: When the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business. **Page H1718**

Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass H.R. 4463, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the "Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office". **Page H1718**

Amelia Earhart Post Office Building: Agreed to take from the Speaker's table and pass 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". **Page H1718**

Quorum—Calls Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1710–11, H1711–12, and H1717–18. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Commerce.

Testimony was heard from Wilbur Ross, Secretary, Department of Commerce.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Testimony was heard from Ben Carson, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Education. Testimony was heard from Betsy DeVos, Secretary, Department of Education.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Nuclear Security Administration. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security officials: Lisa Gordon-Hagerty, Administrator, and Under Secretary for National Security; Phil Calbos, Principal Assistant Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs; Dave Huizenga, Principal Assistant Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Non-proliferation; and Adm. James Caldwell, Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors.

ASSESSING THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET REQUEST AND ACQUISITION REFORM PROGRESS

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Assessing the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request and Acquisition Reform Progress”. Testimony was heard from Mark T. Esper, Secretary of the Army; Richard V. Spencer, Secretary of the Navy; and Heather Wilson, Secretary of the Air Force.

SUBMARINE INDUSTRIAL BASE: OPTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing entitled “Submarine Industrial Base: Options for Construction”. Testimony was heard from James F. Geurts, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition, Department of the Navy, Headquarters, U.S. Navy; Rear Admiral Upper Half Michael E. Jabaley, Program Executive Officer for Submarines, Department of the Navy;

and Rear Admiral Upper Half John W. Tammen, Jr., Director, Undersea Warfare Division (OPNAV 97), Department of the Navy.

NAVY READINESS POSTURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “Navy Readiness Posture”. Testimony was heard from the following U.S. Navy Headquarters officials: Vice Admiral William K. Lescher, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Integration of Capabilities and Resources (N8); Vice Admiral Andrew L. Lewis, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Operations, Plans and Strategy (N3/N5); and Vice Admiral Luke M. McCollum, Chief of Navy Reserve, Commander, Navy Reserve Force.

EXPANDING AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE OPTIONS: EXAMINING THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR’S PROPOSED RULE ON ASSOCIATION HEALTH PLANS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled “Expanding Affordable Health Care Options: Examining the Department of Labor’s Proposed Rule on Association Health Plans”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FISCAL YEAR 2019 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy; and Subcommittee on Environment held a joint hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2019 Nuclear Regulatory Commission Budget”. Testimony was heard from the following Nuclear Regulatory Commission officials: Jeff Baran, Commissioner; Stephen Burns, Commissioner; and Kristine Svinicki, Chairman.

THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION’S ROLE IN COMBATING THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “The Drug Enforcement Administration’s Role in Combating the Opioid Epidemic”. Testimony was heard from Robert W. Patterson, Acting Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration.

EXPLORING THE FINANCIAL NEXUS OF TERRORISM, DRUG TRAFFICKING, AND ORGANIZED CRIME

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance held a hearing entitled “Exploring the Financial Nexus of Terrorism, Drug Trafficking, and Organized Crime”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CDM: GOVERNMENT PERSPECTIVES ON SECURITY AND MODERNIZATION

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection; and the Subcommittee on Information Technology of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform held a joint hearing entitled “CDM: Government Perspectives on Security and Modernization”. Testimony was heard from Max Everett, Chief Information Officer, Department of Energy; Scott Blackburn, Executive in Charge, Office of Information and Technology, Department of Veterans Affairs; David Garcia, Chief Information Officer, Office of Personnel Management; and Kevin Cox, Program Manager, Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation, Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security.

PREVENTABLE VIOLENCE IN AMERICA: AN EXAMINATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION SHARING AND MISGUIDED PUBLIC POLICY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Preventable Violence in America: An Examination of Law Enforcement Information Sharing and Misguided Public Policy”. Testimony was heard from David Bowdich, Deputy Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation; Timothy Carter, Sheriff, Shenandoah County, Virginia; and public witnesses.

ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled “Assessing the Effectiveness of the Transitional Program for Covered Business Method Patents”. Testimony was heard from John Neumann, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

POLICY PRIORITIES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION'S FY 2019 BUDGET FOR INDIAN AFFAIRS AND INSULAR AREAS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing entitled “Policy Priorities for the Administration's FY 2019 Budget for Indian Affairs and Insular Areas”. Testimony was heard from Doug Domenech, Assistant Secretary, Insular Affairs, Department of the Interior; John Tahsuda, Acting Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; and RADM Michael D. Weahkee, Acting Director,

Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing on H.R. 5210, to establish the National Park Restoration Fund, and for other purposes; and H.R. 2584, the “National Park Service Legacy Act of 2017”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Simpson and Hurd; P. Daniel Smith, Deputy Director, National Parks Service, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT: ADVANCING APPRENTICESHIPS FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce held a hearing entitled “Workforce Development: Advancing Apprenticeships for Small Business”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPACTS OF THE 2017 WILDFIRES IN THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled “Impacts of the 2017 Wildfires in the United States”. Testimony was heard from Robert J. Fenton, Jr., Regional Administrator, Region IX, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Mark Ghilarducci, Director, Governor's Office of Emergency Services, California; Susan Gorin, Supervisor, First District, Sonoma County, California; Eric Holly, Deputy Fire Warden, Deputy Director of Emergency Services, Stanislaus County, California; and a public witness.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 888, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain totally disabled veterans; H.R. 4335, the “Servicemember Family Burial Act”; H.R. 4910, the “Veterans Cemetery Benefit Correction Act”; and H.R. 4958, the “Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2018”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Bost, Correa, and Austin Scott of Georgia; Cheryl Rawls, Director, Pension and Fiduciary Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing on H.R. 1206, the “Reducing Barriers for Veterans Education Act of 2017”; H.R. 3023, to amend title 38, United

States Code, to eliminate the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay reporting fees to educational institutions; H.R. 3940, the “Veterans Education Disaster Assistance Act”; H.R. 4451, the “Homeless Veterans’ Reintegration Programs Reauthorization Act of 2017”; H.R. 4830, the “SIT-REP Act”; H.R. 4835, the “Job TOOLS for Veterans Act”; H.R. 5044, the “Service-Disabled Veterans Small Business Continuation Act”; legislation on the VA Home Loan Improvement Act of 2018; and legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from Representatives Bilirakis, Wenstrup, Poe of Texas, Messer, and Russell; MG Robert M. Worley II, U.S. Air Force (Ret.), Director, Education Service, Veterans Benefit Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower, to hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SR-232A.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense policies and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SR-222.

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine the Economic Report of the President, 10:30 a.m., SD-608.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kirsten Dawn Madison, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs), and Thomas J. Hushek, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, both of the Department of State, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Subcommittee on Near East, South Asia, Central Asia, and Counterterrorism, to hold hearings to examine stability and security challenges in Lebanon, 2 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 1250, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of

employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, and S. 2515, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for Indian Programs, 2:30 p.m., SD-628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael Y. Scudder, of Illinois, and Amy J. St. Eve, of Illinois, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, and Charles J. Williams, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for veterans’ programs and fiscal year 2020 advance appropriations requests, 2 p.m., SR-418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold hearings to examine election security, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 10 a.m., H-310 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Agriculture, 1:30 p.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Open World Leadership Trust Fund, 2:30 p.m., HT-2 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “State and Non-State Actor Influence Operations: Recommendations for U.S. National Security”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing entitled “Ground Force Modernization Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2019”, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled “Military Personnel Posture: FY 2019”, 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Combating the Opioid Crisis: Prevention and Public Health Solutions”, 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2683, the “Protecting Veterans Credit Act of 2017”; H.R. 4659, to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to recognize the exposure-reducing nature of client margin for cleared derivatives; H.R. 4790, to amend the Volcker rule to give the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System sole rulemaking authority, to exclude community banks from the requirements of the Volcker rule, and for other purposes; H.R. 4861, the “Ensuring Quality Unbiased Access to Loans Act of 2018”; H.R. 5051, the “Public Company Registration Threshold Act”; H.R. 5076, the “Small Bank Exam Cycle Improvement Act of 2018”; H.R. 5082, the “Practice of Law Technical Clarification Act of 2018”; and H.R.

5323, the “Derivatives Fairness Act”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The FY 2019 Foreign Assistance Budget”, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled “U.S. Responses to China’s Foreign Influence Operations”, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled “Implications of a U.S.-Saudi Arabia Nuclear Cooperation Agreement for the Middle East”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3997, the “Free Veterans from Fees Act”; H.R. 4257, the “Advancing Conservation and Education Act”; H.R. 5005, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the birthplace of James Weldon Johnson in Jacksonville, Florida, as a unit of the National Park System; and H.R. 5269, the “State and Territorial Approval for Restriction of Fishing Act”, 10:15 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans, hearing entitled “Examining the Proposed Fiscal Year 2019

Spending, Priorities and Missions of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Four Power Marketing Administrations”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security, hearing entitled “Bureaucratic Challenges to Hurricane Recovery in Puerto Rico”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, markup on legislation on the American Leadership in Space Technology and Advanced Rocketry Act; legislation on the Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act; and H.R. 5086, the “Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2018”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “American Infrastructure and the Small Business Perspective”, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S. Trade Policy Agenda”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Implementation of MACRA’s Physician Payment Policies”, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Wednesday, March 21

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 1865, Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, and after a period of up to 4 hours of debate, vote on or in relation to Wyden Amendment No. 2212 and Amendment No. 2213, and on passage of the bill.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E341
 Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E347, E349
 Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga, E344
 Buchon, Larry, Ind., E344
 Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E348
 Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E347
 Cheney, Liz, Wyo., E348, E349
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E343

DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E341
 Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E345
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E342
 Frankel, Lois, Fla., E345
 Graves, Sam, Mo., E341, E344, E345, E347
 Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E343
 Katko, John, N.Y., E347, E348
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E346
 Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E347

Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E341, E342, E342, E343, E344, E345, E345, E346, E346, E347
 Poe, Ted, Tex., E342, E344, E345, E346, E348
 Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E348
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E342
 Tsongas, Niki, Mass., E347
 Walters, Mimi, Calif., E342
 Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E341
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E343



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.