



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 2018

No. 58

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 11, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DON BACON 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.

MY COMMITMENT TO DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION AND THE RULE OF LAW AS A CITIZEN OF THIS NATION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, the President said to reporters at the White House on Monday: "And it's a disgrace. It's, frankly, a real disgrace. It's an attack on our country, in a true sense. It's an attack on what we all stand for."

While I agree that there has been a disgraceful attack on our country, I

don't think it is the investigation that is closing in on the President, but rather his disgraceful reaction to it.

We now know, without any doubt, that the special counsel's investigation is closing in on the President and those very, very close to him. I don't think lawful warrants legally executed against the homes, office, and hotel rooms of the President's chief fixer and fellow grifter are the problem.

Rather, it is the constant threats to further obstruct justice by a sitting President, to thwart those lawful investigations from reaching their logical conclusions. That is what I and a lot of patriotic Americans are worried about.

What we find disgraceful is the President's attitude toward law enforcement and the circumstances that have led us to this moment, including the apparent dealings with the Kremlin, the campaign finance violations, the hush money payoffs to silence witnesses, and using one's elected office to influence and even try to end an investigation in which you are the target.

When he is the target, it is called disgraceful.

Before we left for the Easter break, Democrats on the Judiciary Committee made a commitment that we would be on the first plane back to Washington to initiate hearings if the President took action to further obstruct justice, including firing the Attorney General for recusing himself or the deputy attorney general or the special counsel.

The President reiterated his threats to subvert justice by firing key Justice officials this week. So I feel obligated to reiterate my commitment to defend the Constitution and the rule of law as a citizen of this Nation.

Let's be clear. Republicans have no intention of investigating, holding hearings, or taking seriously their constitutional mandate, no matter how far this President goes.

When athletes kneel during the national anthem or the former President

wears a tan suit or salutes a marine while holding a cup of coffee, that is a constitutional crisis. But when the President threatens to fire the special counsel, well, you know.

We cannot rely on Republicans to defend democracy and our system of government as long as they find political and personal advantage in walking lockstep with the President, or they tremble in fear of what would be in a tweet if they stepped out of line.

And we as Democrats, well, we are in the minority, so we are almost powerless unless some of our fellow colleagues put country ahead of party.

But human beings are very resourceful and fight fiercely for their own freedom. When we are united in great numbers, we can accomplish any goal.

In Selma and elsewhere, Dr. King and others showed us that beatings, lynchings, and State-sanctioned discrimination could not withstand the power of the people fighting for justice and equality.

In turn, they inspired, in part, the resistance known as the Prague Spring in Central Europe, when people stood up to tanks and repression, and eventually the wall came down.

In Africa, the Americas, Asia, and across the Arab world, people are still fighting to secure their freedom.

And in China, the image of a lone man standing up to tanks to defend his country moved the world.

One man standing up will not be enough, but many American women and men are already heeding the call. Young people from Parkland, Florida, called us to Washington by the millions, despite viscous attacks.

Women led the way by the millions in Washington and around the world.

And when our Muslim brothers and sisters called us to the airports to oppose Trump's religious ban, we came in numbers.

We have to be ready to come to Washington quickly, massively, energetically, in huge number when the

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H3099

shoe drops. We have to answer the call to defend the country we all love, and we must be unified as Americans.

My fellow Americans, we must be ready to stand up again and again and answer the call when our Nation is under attack and threatened by a tyrant. Together, the American people can fight petty disregard for law and order, the data-driven divisiveness, and media manipulation to defend the country we love.

To do so, we must be ready and we must be together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECOGNIZING THE PATRIOTISM AND GENEROSITY OF AL KATZENBERGER, JR.

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the patriotism and generosity of Al Katzenberger, Jr., a true friend to southern Illinois and its veterans.

After Memorial Day last year, a thunderstorm blew through Mound City National Cemetery in Pulaski County.

The 50 cotton flags that make up the Avenue of Flags of the cemetery were no match for the 70-mile-per-hour winds. Every flagpole was destroyed at this center of pride for our local community.

Upon hearing the news, Alfred, who served in the U.S. Navy for over 40 years, decided to take action. He donated 50 new flagpoles worth over \$12,000.

It is selfless acts like this that help make our community stronger.

To Alfred, we say: Thank you for your decades of service to our Nation and your continued dedication to honoring our Nation's veterans.

REJECT SNAP CUTS IN THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the farm bill should be about helping our farmers and strengthening our food and nutrition programs. It shouldn't be about beating up on poor people.

As the House Agriculture Committee prepares to mark up the 2018 farm bill, I rise to express my deep concern and my outrage with reports that Republicans on the committee are considering drastic cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program known as SNAP.

Press reports indicate that the majority intends to dismantle the core function of SNAP to pay for a huge, new, untested bureaucracy, while cutting and even eliminating benefits for

millions of the most vulnerable Americans, including seniors, older workers, individuals with disabilities, working families with children, and other struggling adults.

We are still awaiting the full details on the plan, which was crafted behind closed doors without any input from Democrats on the committee—I am not even sure any input from Republicans on the committee. But this is what we have learned: that the Republicans intend to focus their cuts in three areas.

First, we are hearing Chairman CONAWAY's bill will eliminate broad-based categorical eligibility, an important State option that helps working families with kids and seniors qualify for benefits when times are tough.

More than 40 States currently implement this option, which allows them to raise income cutoffs and ease asset limits.

Broad-based categorical eligibility also mitigates any cliff effect, albeit small, that exists in SNAP, and eliminating it would penalize families from accruing modest savings to help lift themselves out of poverty.

Estimates suggest that at least 400,000 eligible households will lose their SNAP benefits if broad-based categorical eligibility is eliminated, and 265,000 students will lose access to free lunches at school.

I mean, really?

Mr. Speaker, this is shameful.

We are also reading that the Republicans are looking to cut benefits for households with out-of-pocket utility expenses by disconnecting the link between SNAP and the Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program known as LIHEAP. Doing so will require those with utility expenses to produce the actual bills for each expense rather than receiving a standard allowance. It will force the elderly, it will force people who are disabled and working families to make another trip to the SNAP office and cut benefits for those who are unable to produce the receipts.

Mr. Speaker, we expect that this proposal will cut benefits by at least \$6.6 billion.

Lastly, we have heard the Republicans intend to focus much of their damaging proposal on harsher work requirements that target vulnerable groups of adults who do not have children or other dependents, known as ABAWDs.

We are reading that the Republican majority is proposing to develop a massive new bureaucracy and subject 3 to 5 million vulnerable Americans to new mandatory work requirements.

I want to remind my colleagues that the ABAWD population is diverse. Many have limited access to education, with more than 80 percent having no more than a high school education or a GED. Some have mental health issues, difficult histories of substance abuse, or are ex-offenders with nowhere else to turn. And as many as 60,000 of them are veterans who have served our country.

These childless adults on SNAP are often extremely poor and sometimes experience chronic homelessness. They turn to SNAP as a safety net when they lose their jobs, their hours at work are cut, or their wages are so low that they are unable to make ends meet.

Under current law, ABAWDs are already subjected to severe time limits on the program. They are only provided access to benefits for 3 months out of a 3-year period and are completely cut off from assistance after that time if they have not been able to find work.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should be committed to helping people who are living in poverty and working to help make their lives easier, not cutting them off from assistance when they most need it.

Estimates suggest that as many as 1 million people will lose assistance if these incredibly damaging work proposals advance.

The House Agriculture Committee held 23 hearings on SNAP over the past several years. I attended every single one. We heard testimony from dozens of witnesses, Republicans and Democrats alike; and not one witness, not one, Mr. Speaker, suggested that we make the drastic changes to the program that will cut off those most in need of assistance, let alone the ones whom the Republican majority are advancing.

Quite frankly, I don't know where these ideas are coming from, maybe some rightwing think tank, but they are certainly not coming from the Agriculture Committee.

Let's be clear about what is happening. Speaker RYAN made clear a few weeks ago that he views the farm bill as a key piece of his misguided welfare reform agenda. And just yesterday, President Trump issued a new executive order aimed at forcing SNAP recipients off of assistance.

The Republican farm bill isn't about trying to help people. It is about politics and it is about appeasing the rightwing of the Republican party. It relies on negative stereotypes to advance the goal of undermining our safety net programs and cutting people off of help who need it most. It is disgusting.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with you, I plead with Chairman CONAWAY and Republicans in this Congress to stop this attack on those who are living in poverty. SNAP is an important program. It is about providing people food, and I urge my colleagues on both sides to reject any and all proposals that will undermine this important program.

Mr. Speaker, the war against the poor must stop.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of National Library Week, which began on Sunday and runs through Saturday, April 14.

This year's theme is Library's Lead, and ballerina Misty Copeland is this year's honorary chair.

First sponsored in 1958, National Library Week is an observance sponsored by the American Library Association and libraries across the country each April.

It is time to celebrate the contributions of our Nation's libraries and librarians and to promote library use and support. All types of libraries—school, public, academic, and special—participate.

Celebrations during National Library Week include: National Library Workers Day, celebrated yesterday, which is a day for library staff, users, administrators, and friends groups to recognize the valuable contributions made by all library workers.

National Bookmobile Day, which is celebrated today, recognizes contributions of our Nation's bookmobiles and the dedicated professionals who make quality bookmobile outreach possible in their communities.

Tomorrow is Take Action for Libraries Day, which is a national library advocacy effort.

Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 60th anniversary of National Library Week.

In the mid-1950s, research showed that Americans were spending less on books and more on radios and television and musical instruments. Concerned that Americans were reading less, the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers formed a nonprofit citizens organization called the National Book Committee in 1954.

□ 1015

The committee's goals range from encouraging people to read in their increasing leisure time to improving income and health and developing a strong and happy family life.

In 1957, the committee developed a plan for National Library Week based on the idea that, once people were motivated to read, they would support and use libraries. With the cooperation of the American Library Association and with the help of the Advertising Council, the first National Library Week was observed in 1958 with a theme "Wake Up and Read."

National Library Week was observed again in 1959, and the American Library Association Council voted to continue the annual celebration. When the National Book Committee disbanded in 1974, the American Library Association assumed full sponsorship. Today, it is an annual celebration, marking six decades this year.

The 2018 honorary chair, Misty Copeland, is not only a best-selling author, but she is also the principal dancer at the American Ballet Theatre,

making her the first African-American woman to ever be promoted to that position in the company's 75-year history.

Misty's passion is giving back, and she has worked with many charitable organizations and is dedicated to giving of her time to work with and mentor young boys and girls. It is clear that she is an excellent role model for our youth and a strong supporter of libraries.

Mr. Speaker, libraries have always been great equalizers in our society. Our libraries promote knowledge as a power and ensure that it is within reach of every American, regardless of their personal life circumstances.

From the magnificent Library of Congress to small-town community libraries, I wish everyone a happy National Library Week.

RECOGNIZING DR. WILLIE J. HAGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Willie J. Hagan, who is retiring after a storied career as an educator and, most recently, served as president of the California State University Dominguez Hills, which is in California's 44th Congressional District. I am also proud that he is able to join us today in this Chamber.

Dr. Hagan began his career at the University of Connecticut, where he earned a Ph.D. in psychology before moving to southern California to become the vice president of administration at Cal State Fullerton. During his time there, he somehow found time to earn a master of fine arts in screenwriting from UCLA and also to write a screenplay.

During his tenure at Cal State Dominguez Hills, Dr. Hagan worked tirelessly to advance the goals of the university by providing quality education, scholarship opportunities, and services that have been truly transformative.

Under Dr. Hagan's leadership, Cal State Dominguez Hills experienced continuous growth in graduation rates, enrollment, tenure-track faculty appointments, and enhanced student services, while bringing distinction to the university. Dr. Hagan led an unwavering commitment to students' success, which promoted highly impactful student-focused initiatives.

Dr. Hagan is a well-respected and admired educator who has demonstrated his commitment to the advancement of higher education and community growth.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Dr. Hagan the best of luck in his future endeavors, which I am sure will include spending time with his wife, Betty, who is also an educator.

PATROL THE RIO GRANDE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, national security is border security. Recently, I visited my friend Congressman CUELLAR's hometown of Laredo, Texas, on the Texas-Mexico border.

Being from Texas, I have been to the border about 20 times since I have been elected to Congress. The border is actually the middle of the Rio Grande River, not the shoreline.

I toured the river with our Border Patrol, Texas State law enforcement officers, and the National Guard. It is a long border. From El Paso to Brownsville, Texas, it is about 900 miles—a river border. Laredo is right in the southern border of Texas.

Standing on the United States side of the border near Laredo, I looked across straight into Mexico. A seemingly innocent stark-white water plant peeked out over the thick brush. Looking closer, a figure appeared, having a radio and binoculars in his hand. Why? He was waiting for the Border Patrol to pass; ready to send a "go" signal to another group of illegals waiting to rush across the Rio Grande River.

The drug cartels, Mr. Speaker, control border crossings, whether they are smuggling drugs, people, or criminals. The cartels have an advanced system in place, a sophisticated criminal network. They have scouts on both sides of the border with cell phones and surveillance equipment. They have stash houses on both sides of the border where they hide drugs and people so they can move them closer inland to America.

Everyone pays to cross. In the Laredo sector, the violent Los Zetas cartel is in control. No one crosses into the United States without their permission. The cartels, the Zetas, for example, hide in the bushes, ready to stop anyone who tries to cross without their permission and without paying the money. How much it costs depends on where the person is from. But everyone pays, whether a person is from Central America, China, or Mexico.

Make no mistake about it: the cartels are the ones that make money off of illegals crossing into the United States.

President Trump has authorized State Governors to use the National Guard to help secure and protect the borders. Our Border Patrol agents do the best they can to apprehend illegal crossers, but they are outmanned, outgunned, and outfinanced. Technology helps, but there is far too little of it.

The cameras operating in the Laredo sector are from the 1990s. A cell phone camera is better than the cameras that they have. We need to have high-tech cameras along the entire border. Cameras help spot illegals as they slip over the river and through the tangled brush on both sides of the river.

The National Guard will take over monitoring these cameras, monitoring

sensor activations, conducting surveillance on skyboxes or other observation posts, and operating vehicles. This will free up law enforcement resources to patrol the border and make arrests.

We must have a mix of both physical and virtual barriers on the Texas-Mexico border. For example, Laredo needs about 30 more camera towers to actually secure the border. Border Patrol needs to see the illegals and adjust manpower needed for the threat.

The United States needs to prevent people from crossing into the United States in the first place by having boats in the Rio Grande River. Remember, the center of the river is the international border, not the shoreline in the United States. Once a person crosses and they are on the shore, they are in the United States. They are not on the border. Boats from Customs and Border Patrol, the State of Texas, and the Coast Guard should patrol the border.

I have traveled the Rio Grande River with Texas law enforcement, and where there is a boat present, illegals do not cross. Our longtime policy was to let people cross into the United States, then apprehend as many as we could and send a few back to their native country. That philosophy needs to change by keeping illegals, drugs, and gangs from crossing in the first place. Patrol the river.

Also, we must use more aerostats. Those are small blimps that have cameras that look 20 miles in each direction. We must further use the new high-tech fiberoptic lines that run under the shoreline that detect any movement crossing that line, whether it is human, whether it is an animal, whether it is an airplane, whether it is a tunnel beneath or even a bullet.

Our Border Patrol agents are on the front lines and the number of agents is dwindling. There are more officers in the city of New York than there are in the entire Border Patrol. There is no doubt the National Guard deployment will be a welcome relief for our Border Patrol agents.

The greatest country on Earth, Mr. Speaker, must have the moral will to stop illegal entry into the United States. We must address America's border security because it is a national security issue. Secure America first.

And that is just the way it is.

QUESTIONS OF WAR SHOULD BE BROUGHT BEFORE CONGRESS

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I rise because I love my country. I love what it stands for. I love the concept of government of the people, by the people, for the people.

And, Mr. Speaker, because I believe in this and because I believe in the Constitution of the United States of America, I rise to announce that I do not approve of nor do I support of the

notion that we should have war by Twitter, that we should announce that we are going to war with a tweet. I disapprove. I do not support it.

Questions of war should be brought before the Congress of the United States of America for our input, our debate, and our vote. It is easy to say what you would do when you don't have to vote to do it. I believe Congress has a responsibility, a duty, and an obligation to stand up in times like these and make our positions known on questions of war and peace.

This is the Congress of the United States of America. This is our responsibility, and, Mr. Speaker, I am having my staff, as I speak now, tweet out my opposition to that tweet. I want to make sure the people that read Twitter are aware of my position.

I don't know what others will do, but I know this: I am making my demand that Congress have this opportunity to have input.

And, Mr. Speaker, because I love my country, because I love the Constitution, I believe that, if this President should fire Mr. Mueller, Mr. Speaker, he should be impeached. Whether he will be or not is a question to be decided in the House of Representatives, but I can guarantee you this: there will be articles of impeachment if he fires Mr. Mueller. Whether someone else will bring them or not, I do not know. But if no one else does, there will be articles of impeachment because I will bring them.

I love my country. I am not going to watch this President decimate the Constitution.

I love my country. We didn't act when he fired Comey. We should act if he fires Mueller, and I plan to take that action.

I say this in closing: We have seen, under this President, a deterioration of respect for the rule of law. This country is great because no one is above the law. Are we now going to allow the President to be beyond justice?

This is a moment in time, a crucial, critical moment in time for every person to determine whether they are going to be the true patriots that we claim to be. This is our moment. Let us stand up for the Constitution and the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

HONORING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONNECTICUT'S NAVY INSTALLATION

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, April 11, 2018, is a special day in southeastern Connecticut. It marks the 150th anniversary of when the State of Connecticut and the city of New Lon-

don conveyed a deed of gift to the U.S. Navy that today still stands as the Naval Submarine Base New London, which has had a glorious, distinguished career in terms of our national defense.

Again, on that date in 1867, when the deed was signed and given to Gideon Welles, who was the Secretary of the Navy at the time, himself a native of the State of Connecticut, Glastonbury, Connecticut, it was the result, again, of an effort by one of my predecessors, Congressman Augustus Brandegee, who got an authorization and an appropriation through the Naval Appropriations bill in 1867 that set up this conveyance.

Congressman Brandegee was a distinguished Member of this body. He was a strong supporter of abolition. He voted in favor of the 13th Amendment, and he was somebody who was a frequent friend of President Lincoln at the time. They rode horseback together in the morning, and he was a very strong ally of the President.

After that deed of gift was signed, the Navy base was a coaling station that provided a way station for Navy ships in New England waters to again get refueled. It also was a place that Civil War Navy ships were stored in the wake of that conflict.

Again, fast-forward to 1915. That is when the Navy actually designated that base as a submarine base. It was a timely event because, very shortly thereafter, with the U.S. involvement in World War I where U-boat activity, obviously, was the driving force for why the U.S. got into that conflict, the submarine base in New London became a critical part of our effort in terms of that conflict.

Moving forward, even from 1915 when the first G-boat subs arrived at the Navy base in World War II, as Admiral Nimitz, who headed up our efforts particularly in the South Pacific, stated frequently in the wake of Pearl Harbor: It was, in fact, the submarine force that really held the line against the Japanese onslaught that took place in that area.

The Groton base was a site where a lot of the submarines that were part of that conflict actually took on that struggle; again, tragic and catastrophic losses. Nonetheless, I think most historians, particularly in the Pacific region, will affirm it was, in fact, the submarine force that was critical in terms of holding the line, particularly in 1942 and early 1943.

After World War II, the Groton base played another huge role in our national defense with the development of the nuclear Navy. Admiral Hyman Rickover developed the USS *Nautilus*, which was launched in the 1950s. That all took place in Groton and New London, Connecticut. Electric Boat was the shipyard where the *Nautilus* was built.

Today, our submarine force is completely nuclear powered. We have 15 attack submarines at the Groton-New London base which are doing important work both in the European theater, in terms of Putin's much more

aggressive naval resurgent activities, as well as other combatant commands around the world.

So the wisdom of my predecessor, and certainly the State of Connecticut, to site a Navy base—a submarine base—now, today, in a place that is very strategic in terms of critical regions of the world is still paying important dividends for our national defense.

As I am standing here today, there is a ceremony that is taking place to commemorate Congressman Brandegee's vision, Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles' participation, and all the great service that has taken place in the wake of that historic moment.

So to all of you up in the State and to all of the 10,000 sailors that serve at the Groton Navy Base today, I thank you for keeping this incredible legacy and important future mission alive because our national defense depends on it.

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 31 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

Chaplain Scott Foust, U.S. Air Force, Arlington Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Lord, when King David of old faced a seemingly insurmountable mountain of problems to solve, questions to answer, and obstacles to overcome, he uttered a brief yet powerful prayer: "Hear my cry for help, my King and my God, for to You I pray."

Similarly, after our very first President and Commander in Chief took his very first oath of office, he must have felt the weight of the daunting task before him, so he went off script and uttered a brief yet powerful prayer: "So help me God."

I can only begin to imagine the weight of care and the gravity of concern that this body carries, day after day, publicly and privately. With that in mind, before this session begins, we pause to acknowledge our utter dependence upon You, O God, and we humbly echo that powerful sentiment with this brief prayer: Help us, Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS of New York 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 CHAPLAIN SCOTT FOUST

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Chaplain Scott Foust for his opening prayer and message this morning.

Scott resides in Virginia's First District and serves as an Air Force chaplain at Arlington National Cemetery. He has answered the call to serve by helping Air Force families lay loved ones to rest at Arlington National Cemetery, both through coordinating funeral arrangements and providing grief counseling. He served as a pastor for 12 years before receiving a direct commission in 2007.

God calls on us to serve Him in many ways, and I commend Chaplain Foust on his service to our Nation, our airmen, and their families. I pray for Christ's guidance as the House convenes and we try to do His will in serving the American people.

May God always bless Chaplain Foust and his family as they continue to spread Christ's Word and remain a light within the community.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIANFORTE). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THANKING GEORGE ELLIS FOR DEDICATED SERVICE TO PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Mr. George Ellis for his dedicated service to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

At the end of March, George retired as the executive director of the Appalachian Region Independent Power Producers Association. He served in the role since 2015.

The organization has accomplished much during that time, and a lot of credit goes to George for his dedicated efforts and service.

George started his career in 1974 as a staff member, and shortly thereafter, became executive director of the House of Representatives' Mines and Energy Management Committee.

In 1982, George accepted the position of executive vice president of government affairs with the Keystone Bituminous Coal Association, which in 1988 became the PA Coal Mining Association.

In 1996, George was appointed president of the Pennsylvania Coal Association before joining ARIPPA in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, George Ellis has been a highly respected resource in the Pennsylvania coal industry, and his knowledge and dedication are unparalleled. He has had a long and outstanding career, and I wish him the best in his well-deserved retirement.

STUDENTS ARE UNITED IN THEIR FIGHT TO GET WEAPONS OF WAR OFF OUR STREETS

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, 8 weeks ago, a lone gunman entered the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, and in just 6 minutes, killed 17 students and staff and injured 17 others: 1 shooter, 6 minutes, 17 dead, and 17 injured.

In the weeks since, I have stood alongside students at the March for Our Lives in Buffalo, New York, sat down and listened to students from schools across western New York, and participated in a town hall panel discussion by Students for Action.

These students are respectful of the Second Amendment and of those good, law-abiding citizens of gun ownership.

Congress can learn from the thoughtful, reasoned, respectful, and passionate approach demonstrated by each of the students I have encountered. They have come from diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds and different communities, rural, suburban and urban, but they are unified in their fight to get weapons of war off our streets and to end mass school shootings.

Mr. Speaker, we can come together to save lives.

COMMENDING SERGEANTS CHARLES JEFFERS AND GERALD "JAKE" STOFKO

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the careers of Sergeants Charles Jeffers and Gerald "Jake" Stofko of the Johnstown Police Department.

Sergeant Jeffers valiantly served the Johnstown community for 48 years, forging a legacy of bravery in public service.

Sergeant Stofko's 25-year-long career with the Johnstown Police Department is one marked by excellence and dedication. Spending the majority of his career working the midnight shift, the Johnstown residents could sleep soundly knowing that Sergeant Stofko was on watch.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and congratulate these brave officers for their combined 73 years of service and commitment to protecting the people of Johnstown. I wish them both the best as they move forward into the next chapter of their lives.

REPUBLICAN TAX GIVEAWAY INCREASES DEBT BY \$2.1 TRILLION

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Congressional Budget Office revealed that the Republican tax giveaway to corporations and the wealthiest Americans will increase our debt by \$2.1 trillion.

Over the next 10 years, our debt will equal 105 percent of our gross domestic product, according to the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget.

And the Republicans' idea to close this gigantic increase in the deficit is to make massive cuts to Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid. They want seniors to sacrifice their retirement security and their dignity in order to pay for a Republican tax giveaway.

President Trump's budget for fiscal year 2019 cuts \$500 billion from Medicare, \$1.4 trillion from Medicaid, and \$72 billion from Social Security disability insurance, and that still isn't enough to balance the budget. So they will, of course, continue to propose cuts to education, veterans, working people, and other critical resources for families across America.

This is shameless. The American people are going to see right through this. A gigantic tax cut for the richest people in this country, the most powerful corporations, and now the Republicans are trying to make seniors pay for it by cuts to Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid. Shame on them.

MONTANA IS BENEFITING FROM THE TAX CUTS

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to let colleagues know that the tax cuts are working in Montana.

For the last 2 weeks, I met with hard-working Montanans who are benefiting from tax cuts.

Owners of the Billings Flying Service are investing in new equipment, as well as more research and development.

Workers at the UPS facility in Missoula are receiving expanded benefits and more money in their paychecks.

The owner of KFC restaurants throughout Montana gave employees a raise, boosted starting wages, and plans renovations for many of its facilities.

Owners at Loenbro in Great Falls are increasing benefits and investing in new equipment.

A farmer near Bozeman plans to double his food processing staff from 6 to 12.

Mr. Speaker, the tax cuts are working in Montana and throughout the country. They are leading to job creation, bigger paychecks, greater investment, higher wages, and economic growth. We must remain focused on policies to encourage growth, optimism, and the American Dream.

THE FARM BILL MUST PROTECT NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, every day, over 162,000 people in my county of Mecklenburg are considered food insecure. Worse, 47,000 of those are children who risk going to bed hungry every night.

No one should have to wonder where their next meal will come from.

In 2015, I founded the Adams Hunger Initiative to bring together a coalition of advocates in Mecklenburg to end hunger in our community.

For over 3 years, we fought to protect important anti-hunger programs like SNAP, expand public-private partnerships, and find creative ways to the systemic issues that leave families hungry.

The coalition will visit Capitol Hill to continue advocating for our priorities.

During National Nutrition Month, we sent a letter to the chairman and ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee urging protection for SNAP benefits in the upcoming farm bill.

Thirty-five thousand households in Mecklenburg and 20.3 million nationwide rely on SNAP to put food on their family's table.

As Congress considers the next farm bill, we must protect nutrition programs for those who need them most

and ensure that no one in Mecklenburg or in America goes hungry.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Equal Pay Day.

The Equal Pay Act became law more than 50 years ago, and today women comprise almost half of the American workforce. They serve in our hospitals, schools, and our factories. They are executives at major corporations. They are doctors, they are lawyers, and they serve in countless other occupations that make our economy one of the greatest in the world.

Yet, women are still disadvantaged by the gender wage gap. They are compensated at only 80 cents for every dollar earned by a man.

This must not continue. It is unjust, it prevents a fair and productive economy, and is something that we need to close, this gap. Closing the wage gap is an economic imperative.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIANFORTE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 11, 2018.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 11, 2018, at 10:56 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 455.
Relative to the death of the Honorable Daniel K. Akaka, former United States Senator for the State of Hawaii.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1215

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 814

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Rothfus.
The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4790, VOLCKER RULE REGULATORY HARMONIZATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 811 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 811

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4790) to amend the Volcker rule to give the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System sole rule-making authority, to exclude community banks from the requirements of the Volcker rule, and for other purposes. 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 115-67 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; and (2) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of April 12, 2018, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Debate on such a motion shall be extended to four hours. (b) The Chair may postpone further consideration of a motion considered pursuant to subsection (a) to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. BUCK. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

The rule makes in order one bill reported favorably by the Committee on

Financial Services. The committee held several hearings on the topics within this bill in the spring of 2017.

Additionally, it was marked up in committee, and a Democrat amendment in the nature of a substitute was adopted by voice. The bill was reported by a strong, bipartisan vote of 50-10. The rule makes in order no amendments to the bill. Why? Because there were none offered.

Additionally, the rule provides the opportunity for this House to consider a balanced budget amendment and more than quadruples the time for debate on the floor than it would otherwise be provided.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I have the opportunity to come down to the floor and manage debate for a Financial Services bill. Thinking of the process that I just referenced a moment ago, one thing routinely strikes me: so many of these Financial Services bills are overwhelmingly bipartisan within the Committee on Financial Services.

There always seems to be a common theme and political rhetoric that Republicans are shills for the banking industry. Setting a rebuttal to that aside for now, the underlying bill before us contains a wholly bipartisan piece of legislation.

That a committee run by Republicans would have a process whereby we bring to the floor a major piece of reform legislation offered by both a Republican and a Democrat is a real testament to the fact that this House can work. I commend Chairman HENSARLING for running the committee in such a way.

Mr. Speaker, our small town and community banks are a much bigger part of our lives than many may realize. Often here in Washington, we get caught up in big players in industry. We talk about Wall Street and Silicon Valley. We speak of countries and international relations. However, all across this great land, Americans in small, medium, and large communities go about their business and conduct their day-to-day affairs without any of the issues that consume Washington touching their lives.

Most Americans just simply want Washington to leave them in peace, to allow them to live their lives without politics and government intruding at every step. This Financial Services bill before us speaks to those concerns. This is legislation for Main Streets all across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there are nearly 6,000 community banks across this country with 52,000 locations. These banks are the backbone of our communities' finances. Collectively, they hold more than \$3.2 trillion in loans to consumers. They provide nearly 50 percent of all small business loans and nearly 80 percent of all agriculture loans.

How is it that they claim such a huge portion of loans within our communities? It is simple. They are also part of the community that they serve, and they extend credit based on personal

knowledge of their neighbors and their local economy.

But they are more than just organizations that lend and offer banking services. They are small businesses that employ more than 750,000 Americans. Clearly, community banks are key partners in our communities. They are particularly important lenders in rural towns and counties, such as the ones I represent in eastern Colorado.

Former Federal Reserve Chair Janet Yellen summed it best when she said: "We know that community banks serve many customers that large banks do not and provide services that are not offered by large banks in many communities. This circumstance is especially true in rural areas and other small communities, where community banks are sometimes the only retail financial institutions."

However, even with their importance to Americans, they have borne the brunt of regulation under Dodd-Frank. Each new regulation drives up costs and forces personnel resources to be diverted to compliance efforts. Even if a particular institution is not ultimately subject to a rule, it must spend resources on each new regulation released to verify whether any part of its operations are impacted or not.

These costs place a drain on operations which consumes resources that otherwise would be used for growth.

The Federal Reserve Board recently released data that showed that small bank lending in rural areas had declined by 46 percent since 2005. According to the Independent Community Bankers of America, a 2014 survey of community banks revealed that 78 percent of banks reported adding personnel just to deal with increased regulation.

By consuming resources that could otherwise be placed into serving customers and increasing lending, community banks are many times forced to consolidate just to remain alive. Today, there are 1,700 fewer community banks than there were in 2010. As of May 2017, only three new banks were formed since the financial crisis.

It is clear that our community banks are suffering under an unbearable regulatory burden. And when our community banks suffer, our small towns and rural communities suffer also.

The underlying bill before us today exempts community banks from yet another regulation that lumps small institutions with big banks. The Volcker rule was implemented by Dodd-Frank. It was intended to keep banks from engaging in a practice known as proprietary trading. Proprietary trading is a practice where a financial institution such as a bank uses its own finances to buy and sell stocks and other investments so as to make a profit for itself.

Because of their importance to each individual American, but also to our broader economy, we should consider carefully how we allow financial institutions to operate. However, the real

impact of the Volcker rule on community banks has served to undermine investment options in our smaller communities.

All across this country, particularly in rural communities, entrepreneurs, farmers, and others sell their equity or bonds in order to raise capital to grow and expand. However, if community banks were prohibited from buying these financial instruments, then the sellers would have to find buyers on their own. That is a highly impractical situation.

Under the Volcker rule, an entrepreneur cannot approach their community bank and offer to sell a portion of their equity to the bank. Why? Because Dodd-Frank prohibits the banks from making its own investments. What sense does this make? Where is the entrepreneur supposed to go to find a buyer for their equity? Are they supposed to go door-to-door looking for someone who might want to invest? That is nonsense.

Community banks play a vital role in purchasing these financial instruments and holding them until the bank is approached by a willing buyer. Or maybe the bank holds them for a brief period as they know they have a customer who is searching for this type of investment.

Either way, this is not an evil practice that we should prohibit. The community bank's actions are making a marketplace for these investment transactions, and this should be encouraged. It increases access to capital for small businesses and farms in our communities.

But it is not just on the selling side of the equation that this practice benefits. It also benefits the buying side of the equation. Many Americans have invested a portion of their retirement savings in pension funds, mutual funds, or similar types of investments. These funds need for their investments to be liquid so as to meet demands for cash from the people who have chosen to save their money in the funds.

These funds often place these cash investments into smaller financial institutions through purchasing the stocks or bonds that these banks own. The banks allow these larger funds to purchase the bank's assets and also to sell back to the bank the same assets when the funds need cash.

This isn't a shady practice. This is an extraordinarily important practice and benefits every single American who has saved or is saving money in a pension or other retirement account.

The Volcker rule prohibits this activity. Washington, in its typically arrogant way, decided that it knew better than Americans and banned this under Dodd-Frank.

On December 10, 2013, the five—I repeat, the five—separate agencies tasked with writing and enforcing this regulation released a final regulation that is 932 pages long and contains nearly 300,000 words.

That is astounding. What small town community bank can, on top of all of

the other regulations heaped upon them, carve out the necessary resources to comply with such a burden?

When we had this bill at Rules Committee yesterday, one of my colleagues on the committee related a story of visiting one of his community banks. He indicated that it was a fairly small bank. The owner of the bank walked him into the back operations office and pointed to 14 staff members working. All of them were working exclusively on complying with regulations. That is 14 people not serving customers, or seeking new depositors, or helping the community grow. What a sad state to which we have arrived.

Washington heaps, and heaps, and heaps burdens on the backs of Americans day in and day out. Technocrats make it harder and harder to achieve success in this land.

We are still a land of opportunity, but that gift is threatened daily by our bureaucracy. Endless regulation of every meaningful detail of our lives is antithetical to the American way.

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

□ 1230

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the underlying legislation. Quite frankly, I had hoped that, when we returned from our Easter break, we would be debating and voting on legislation that would help people. I had hoped that maybe we would be able to finally help the hundreds of thousands of Dreamers whose lives are now in limbo because of President Trump's decision to end DACA and that we would be able to pass a bill called the Dream Act to actually provide them some peace of mind. But, no, we don't see that on the schedule.

I had also hoped that maybe we would do something to address the epidemic of gun violence in this country. Millions of young people all across the country have been protesting in front of congressional offices and have been holding rallies demanding that Congress debate the issue of gun violence and do something. No, we are not doing that.

Instead, what we are doing is another bill to help the financial services industries, and in that effort, we are doing something that I think is going to make consumer protections less relevant. This week, again, the Republican leadership of this House is ignoring the most pressing issues facing our country and our constituents in favor of more legislation to roll back financial protections put into place to prevent another financial crisis.

Need I remind my friends on the other side of the aisle how damaging

the 2008 financial crash was? Millions upon millions of Americans—our constituents, Mr. Speaker—lost their homes, and they lost their jobs and their life savings. Many of these families have still not fully recovered from these terrible financial blows.

In response, Democrats in Congress came together to pass the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, landmark legislation to address risk in our financial system and ensure our constituents are protected from another damaging financial crisis.

Dodd-Frank isn't perfect. Nobody in this Congress says it is. But I strongly object to the calculated campaign by Republicans in this House to continue to chip away at the law, making our financial markets more vulnerable just to benefit their billionaire donors.

One of the key provisions of Dodd-Frank is the Volcker rule. It prohibits banks from engaging in risky trading activities that contributed to the 2008 financial crisis. Simply put, it prevents banks from acting like casinos and gambling with our money.

The rule we are considering today provides for consideration of H.R. 4790, legislation to undermine the Volcker rule by exempting certain banks from the requirements. The bill also puts rulemaking authority solely in the hands of the Federal Reserve, making it easier for the Trump administration to further weaken or eventually repeal this vital consumer protection.

Now, that is, of course, the goal of my Republican colleagues in the first place. They have continually advanced legislation to roll back and weaken the rules put into place to prevent another financial crisis. It is deeply frustrating, and more importantly, it is very dangerous to the financial security of the American economy and American families.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this rule also provides for additional debate time on the Republican majority's misguided balanced budget amendment, H.J. Res. 2.

Normally, when legislation of this magnitude is debated, the leadership of this House brings it through the Rules Committee to set the terms of debate and to allow for alternative proposals to be offered and debated. This will be the seventh time a balanced budget amendment has been voted on in the House.

In the past, it has generally been considered under a structured rule granting many hours of general debate, making in order substitute amendments, and providing the minority with a motion to recommit. But as they did in 2011, Republicans will once again bring this legislation to the floor under suspension of the rules, providing no opportunity—none—for Members of the majority or the minority to offer any substitute amendments.

Now, why does this matter, Mr. Speaker? It matters because this legislation, the so-called balanced budget amendment, could do irreparable harm

to our economy. It would hinder Congress' ability to respond appropriately to an economic crisis and could potentially even create one. It could even require Congress to cut funding for safety net programs that millions of our constituents rely on, programs like Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP—which is the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—Supplemental Security Income, and veterans' pensions.

We owe it to our constituents to have a full and open debate on this legislation, to hear from experts and to thoughtfully consider alternatives. But this Republican majority didn't even take the time to hold a hearing or a markup on H.J. Res. 2. They are rushing it to the floor under suspension of the rules with no opportunity for us to consider any alternative proposals whatsoever.

We are talking about amending the Constitution of the United States. Why in the world would we want to use such a flawed process on such an important issue? Mr. Speaker, because maybe this isn't a serious effort in the first place. My Republican friends know this awful legislation will never become law.

So why are we wasting the House's time on this effort? I have a simple answer: to appease the far-right wing of the Republican Party in an election year and to give the impression that these guys, these Republicans, are somehow fiscally responsible.

You don't have to take my word for it. Republican Representative CHARLIE DENT of Pennsylvania confirmed in the press this week that this is merely a messaging vote. If you think this is cynical, consider for a moment the impetus of bringing this legislation to the floor.

Press reports indicate that Speaker RYAN agreed to a vote on the balanced budget amendment in exchange for votes to advance the Republican tax scam. Can you believe that? Speaker RYAN, the leader of this House, is advancing legislation that could do irreparable harm to our economy and our safety net just so he could jam through his precious tax giveaway to corporations and wealthy donors last December.

Let me remind everyone just how terrible the tax scam Republicans rammed through Congress really is:

It raises taxes on 68 million middle class families to give 83 percent of the tax cuts included in the bill to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

It gives a \$1.3 trillion tax rate break to the largest corporations in this country and rewards these same corporations for shipping jobs overseas.

Here is the other part: it explodes the deficit by \$2 trillion, jeopardizing the future of Medicare and Medicaid.

But this balanced budget amendment is supposed to trick people into believing Republicans still care about fiscal responsibility. It really is disheartening.

There is a pattern here, Mr. Speaker. At every turn, House Republicans favor

the well-off and well-connected while ignoring the needs of those in the middle class and working class and certainly turning their backs on those struggling in poverty.

I meet with constituents in my district every day. Quite frankly, they don't ask what we are doing to repeal Dodd-Frank. They certainly don't ask us to ransack Social Security and cut Medicare to give tax breaks to big corporations.

They want better jobs and they want better wages. They want us to fix our crumbling infrastructure in their communities and to invest in education. They want us to protect our water and air from pollution. They made it clear to us last month, when over 1 million young people took to the streets across this country, that they want action on legislation to protect our communities from the plague of gun violence.

But the Republican leadership is ignoring this call, and it is ignoring any call for progress in favor of legislation to help the wealthy and well-connected donor class.

I get it. They need all this money for reelection. But the price is being paid by the American people. They are getting legislation that is not in their best interest but is in the best interest of a few wealthy donors.

It is reckless and it is wrong. Over 66 percent of the legislation that we have considered in the Rules Committee this year—that is over half—has been bills to roll back regulations on Wall Street and the financial industry. I don't see millions of people protesting in the street to give Wall Street a bigger break. I don't hear the voices being raised all across this country to say: "Let's make the rich even richer. Let's do more to give corporations tax breaks." I don't hear that, and yet that is what the focus of this Congress has been about.

By the way, the vast majority of these bills to help the well-connected and the well-off haven't even gone through regular order. This whole process has been a joke. The legislation we are set to consider later this week is no exception.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this restrictive rule, to oppose efforts to weaken the Volcker rule, and to oppose the balanced budget amendment when it is considered later this week.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of the Republican majority is on full display today. After passing a \$1.5 trillion tax scam bill that showers all the benefits on the wealthy and very rich corporations, we are now going to consider an amendment to the Constitution to balance the Federal budget on the backs of hardworking Americans by eviscerating social safety net programs.

According to the AARP, this balanced budget amendment could subject Social Security and Medicare to deep cuts without regard to the impact on the health and financial security of our most vulnerable citizens. Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget amendment would put the pillars of our social safety net at risk. If you don't believe me, again, maybe you will listen to our friends at the AARP.

They said, this week, in a letter: "A balanced budget amendment would likely harm Social Security and Medicare, subjecting both programs to potentially deep cuts without regard to the impact on the health and financial security of individuals."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the AARP's letter.

AARP,
April 9, 2018.

DEAR MEMBER: AARP is writing to express our opposition to a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. AARP is the nation's largest nonprofit, nonpartisan organization dedicated to empowering Americans 50 and older to choose how they live as they age. With nearly 38 million members and offices in every state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, AARP works to strengthen communities and advocate for what matters most to families with a focus on health security, financial stability and personal fulfillment.

A balanced budget amendment would likely harm Social Security and Medicare, subjecting both programs to potentially deep cuts without regard to the impact on the health and financial security of individuals. It would also likely diminish the resources available for programs assisting Americans who are least able to provide for themselves—services such as meals or heating for those who are too poor or physically unable to take care of their basic needs without some support.

A balanced budget amendment would prohibit outlays for a fiscal year from exceeding total receipts for that fiscal year. It would impose a constitutional cap on all spending that is equivalent to the revenues raised in any given year. Because revenues fluctuate based on many factors, spending would, out of necessity fluctuate as well under a balanced budget amendment. Consequently, Social Security and Medicare benefits would also fluctuate, potentially subjecting each to sudden or deep cuts. Social Security and Medicare would therefore cease to provide a predictable source of financial and health security in retirement under a balanced budget amendment.

The lack of a dependable Social Security and Medicare benefit would be devastating for millions of Americans. Social Security is currently the principal source of income for half of older American households receiving benefits, and roughly one in five households depend on Social Security benefits for nearly all (90 percent or more) of their income. Over 50 million Americans depend on Medicare, half of whom have incomes of less than \$24,150. Even small fluctuations in premiums and cost sharing would have a significant impact on the personal finances of older and disabled Americans.

Individuals who have contributed their entire working lives to earn a predictable benefit during their retirement would find that their retirement income and health care out of pocket costs would vary significantly year-to-year, making planning difficult and peace of mind impossible.

It is particularly inappropriate to subject Social Security to a balanced budget amendment given that Social Security is an off-budget program that is separately funded through its own revenue stream, including significant trust fund reserves to finance benefits. Imposing a cap on Social Security outlays is unjustifiable, especially when the Social Security trust funds ran a surplus for decades—reducing the past need for additional government borrowing from the public—and resulted in a public debt that is less today than what it otherwise would have been.

Older Americans truly understand that budgets matter and that we all need to live within our means. However, they also understand that budgets affect real people; and they certainly understand the difference between programs to which they have contributed and earned over the course of a lifetime of work, and those they have not. AARP opposes the adoption of a balanced budget amendment that puts Social Security and Medicare at risk. If you have any questions, please have your staff contact Joyce A. Rogers, SVP, Government Affairs Office.

Sincerely,

NANCY LEAMOND,

Executive Vice President and Chief Advocacy and Engagement Officer.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this uncertainty could devastate the nearly half of older American households whose principal incomes come from Social Security or the over 50 million Americans who depend on Medicare. Even small cuts to Social Security checks or increases to Medicare premiums could impact the finances of older Americans and disabled Americans.

Now, the same week that the Congressional Budget Office predicts this Republican majority and their tax scam bill will lead to the return of trillion-dollar deficits, we will consider a balanced budget amendment that has been subject to no hearings and no markups. Even for this record-breaking closed Republican Congress, to attempt to amend our Constitution for only the 28th time in our Nation's history in this manner, quite frankly, is stunning.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask that my colleagues vote "no" on the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule which would amend the bill to exempt Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, vital pillars of our social safety net.

I would just say to my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle who go home to their constituents and regularly talk about how great Social Security is, how great Medicare is, and how important Medicaid is, if you really believe it, you are going to vote to defeat the previous question so we can offer this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, 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 (Mr. ROTHFUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today we are seeing that the GOP tax scam is one long con. Last year, they gave away trillions of dollars to the very wealthiest Americans and the largest corporations while bragging about letting an extra \$1.50 trickle down to hardworking public school employees. It is clear what they really intended. It was a setup.

Who is going to take the fall? Seniors, the disabled, children, and those who are sick.

The GOP tax scam exploded the deficit by nearly \$2 trillion, and now this balanced budget constitutional amendment is laying the groundwork for an attack on Medicare, on Medicaid, and on Social Security.

Now we are considering a constitutional amendment, a change to our Nation's founding document. For all of the pocket Constitution wagging from the GOP, in light of their recent action, this amendment amounts to little more than a political farce. If the GOP wanted a balanced budget, they should propose one.

Instead, President Trump's budgets have threatened the poorest Americans with the biggest cuts—slashing \$500 billion from Medicare, \$1.4 trillion from Medicaid, and \$72 billion from Social Security disability—and it still doesn't balance.

This week, the Congressional Budget Office released the devastating impact of the GOP tax scam. Fiscal year 2018 deficits will increase by \$139 billion to a total of \$804 billion.

Republicans have put our national debt on track to eclipse the size of our economy by 2028. Let me say that again. Our national debt, because of these reckless policies, will put our debt on track to eclipse the size of our economy.

□ 1245

The idea that the GOP tax scam would pay for itself has been exposed as a lie. Now we know what is at risk to help pay for these handouts to billionaires and large corporations: our seniors, disabled Americans, children, and those who are sick.

Over 55 million Americans rely on Medicare. More than 67 million Americans depend on Social Security. These programs represent the bedrock of the secure retirement that is too often challenged by high prices at the doctor and pharmacy. Social Security is already off budget. It never has added a penny to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, this balanced budget amendment would threaten the 120,000 retirees, over 13,000 disabled workers, and more than 5,000 kids in my home district who are depending upon this Congress to keep their promise to not

cut their hard-earned benefits. Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are more than just the most successful and popular government programs to ever exist; they are solemn promises that we make to one another as Americans. This constitutional amendment would break those promises, and it would put the hard-earned Social Security and Medicare benefits of tens of millions of Americans at risk.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the previous question so that we can protect the promise that we made to vulnerable Americans by exempting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid from the balanced budget amendment. Our constituents deserve nothing less than our standing up for them, for the promise that we have made to them, and for those who depend upon these vital programs. The way we can do that is to vote no on the previous question and pass legislation that will enable us to do exactly that.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is attempting to amend the United States Constitution with a bill that has had no hearing, no markup, and will be considered without any opportunity to offer amendments or even a motion to recommit.

We have only amended the Constitution 27 times in our Nation's history. Why isn't the Republican leadership treating this with the seriousness that it deserves? Maybe because even conservative members of their own party know that this vote is a charade.

In a Politico article titled "Conservatives irate over GOP spending hypocrisy," Freedom Caucus Chairman MARK MEADOWS said: "There is no one on Capitol Hill, and certainly no one on Main Street, that will take this vote seriously."

I couldn't agree more. Republicans just added almost \$2 trillion to the deficit with their tax cut for billionaires. As the president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget said in the same article: "This reads as, 'Give us something to hide behind,' rather than a serious process proposal."

But we are here because Republican leadership is trying to check a box, as the Club for Growth put it, in hopes that people will forget their tax scam giveaway. And no wonder why Congress' approval rating is at just 15 percent. This is a dangerous gimmick that my Republican colleagues are pushing. If this is successful, it will lead to major cuts to Social Security, to Medicare, and to Medicaid. We need to take that seriously, and we need to stop it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this Politico article titled "Conservatives irate over GOP's spending hypocrisy."

[From POLITICO, Apr. 10, 2018]

CONSERVATIVES IRATE OVER GOP'S SPENDING HYPOCRISY

(By Rachael Bade and Sarah Ferris)

House Republican leaders, stung by President Donald Trump's rebuke of Congress' recent trillion-dollar spending spree, are moving to give their rank and file cover by passing a balanced budget amendment this week.

But many conservatives, including a good number of House Republicans, say the vote is insincere at best—and blatantly hypocritical at worst.

"There is no one on Capitol Hill, and certainly no one on Main Street, that will take this vote seriously," said Freedom Caucus Chairman Mark Meadows (R-N.C.), on the heels of a \$1.3 trillion spending package that Republicans approved just last month.

"Leadership is just trying to check a box here," added Andrew Roth, vice president for government affairs at the Club for Growth. "I don't see how voters can distinguish between Republicans and Democrats when it comes to spending."

One conservative commentator, Barbara Bolland, equated the upcoming exercise to "gorging on a sumptuous feast while insisting that you want a svelte physique." And other members of the House Freedom Caucus, all of whom voted against a \$1.3 trillion spending package in late March, are calling it little more than a charade.

"The time to get spending under control was four weeks ago," said Rep. Jim Jordan (R-Ohio), again referring to the late-March spending vote. "Coming back four weeks later and saying, 'Oh, now we're going to pound our chest like Tarzan and say we're for a balanced budget amendment,' it's not going to fool anybody."

Jordan and Meadows support the balanced budget amendment as a marker for fiscal austerity—it's the timing of the vote, on the heels of the spending bonanza, that rankles them and other conservatives.

The proposal requires supermajorities in both chambers to pass, as well as ratification by three-quarters of the states, an impossible hurdle. But with Republicans swimming in red ink—the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office projected regular trillion-dollar annual deficits starting in 2020, despite a growing economy—the party feels pressure to do something.

The CBO's deficit forecast hasn't been that bleak since the Great Recession. And this time, Republicans can't blame Barack Obama and the Democrats.

Rather, it's a result of a combination of GOP-approved bills: tax cuts that CBO now expects to add \$1.9 trillion to the deficit over 10 years; a newly passed bipartisan deal to raise strict spending caps by \$320 billion for two years; and a recent \$100 billion infusion of cash into emergency disaster coffers—almost entirely unpaid for.

The balanced budget amendment has been a staple of the GOP playbook going back at least to Newt Gingrich's 1994 Contract with America. It often resurfaces after major spending battles that leave conservatives feeling jilted. The last vote, for instance, followed the 2011 debt ceiling crisis, when Republicans were anxious about the national debt, which now tops \$20 trillion.

Republicans are returning to it two weeks after Trump chided Congress for wasting money in the omnibus spending deal—a scolding that came as the president backed away from a threatened veto and signed it.

"I will never sign another bill like this again," Trump vowed, adding that "there are a lot of things I'm unhappy about" with it.

His remarks, GOP lawmakers and aides say, effectively threw every Republican who backed the bipartisan deal under the bus at

a time when the party already faces an uphill battle retaining its majority this fall.

Hill Republicans were shocked because White House staff members were in the room negotiating the budget deal with the top four leaders in both chambers. They had reassured some skittish Republicans that it was OK to take the vote because Trump would have their backs.

When they returned home afterward for the spring recess, some Republicans caught flak from constituents, which in turn sent GOP leaders into damage-control mode.

"This reads as, 'Give us something to hide behind,' rather than a serious process proposal," said Maya MacGuineas, president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, who said she'd believe the sincerity of the effort when Republicans propose a budget with actual spending cuts.

Not all fiscal hawks are scorning the effort. Republican Study Committee Chairman Mark Walker (R-N.C.), who asked for a vote on a balanced budget amendment in October, applauded the looming vote—even as he acknowledged the uncomfortable timing for the GOP. Walker argued that it's consistent for Republicans to back the amendment after voting for the omnibus, because of the need to fund the military. Walker added, though, that most members pushing hard for deficit-reduction votes right now personally opposed the spending bill, as he did.

"We don't see this as a show vote. We need this. It's something that we've been talking about for years," Walker said Tuesday.

The balanced budget amendment is one of several measures GOP leaders might bring to the floor in the coming weeks to signal their commitment to lower spending. The effort is being led by House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.), who is working with the White House to try to force a vote on a "rescissions" package that would cut billions of dollars from the just-approved omnibus legislation.

It's still unclear whether the House will take up the measure, which GOP aides say could cut as much as \$20 billion. House appropriators hate the idea, and some more pragmatic-minded Republicans argue it would cripple bipartisan spending negotiations in the future.

Republicans clinched the amount they got for defense only because they gave Democrats some money for their own pet projects. A move to recoup money retroactively would infuriate Democrats—even though GOP leaders fully expect it would fail in the Senate.

GOP leaders similarly expect the balanced budget amendment to fail this week in the House. It requires 290 votes for passage; the last time lawmakers voted on one, in 2011, it failed 261-165, with 25 Democrats backing the bill.

Speaker Paul Ryan was one of only four Republicans to oppose the measure at the time. It is unclear whether he will do so again this year. He said the proposal before the House then could have led to higher taxes to pay for more spending.

A balanced budget amendment would tightly restrict federal spending and require two-thirds of lawmakers to approve any tax changes. Critics argue it would trigger hundreds of billions of dollars in across-the-board cuts.

Ironically, a balanced budget amendment would have potentially prevented the GOP Congress' biggest legislative achievement this year: tax reform. With the amendment, Republicans could not have enacted tax cuts that weren't paid for; these ones were not. The GOP also probably couldn't have gotten the huge budget increase for the Pentagon that was included in the omnibus.

In the Senate, Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) suggested Tuesday that

he might follow suit on a balanced budget amendment vote. He said a vote is "likely . . . at some point."

Democrats are blasting Republicans for what House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer called a "political stunt." The Maryland Democrat on Tuesday said Republicans are "worried" about the midterm elections and "they're flailing about."

"It sounds to me very much," he said, "like they're . . . saying one thing and doing another, speaking out of both sides of their mouth."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Congressman JIM JORDAN of Ohio, again another Freedom Caucus member, said on the balanced budget amendment: "The time to get spending under control was 4 weeks ago. Coming back 4 weeks later and saying, 'Oh, now we're going to pound our chest like Tarzan and say we're for a balanced budget amendment,' it's not going to fool anybody."

I would argue that the time to get spending under control was when Republicans exploded the deficit with their tax cut for billionaires. I agree with Mr. JORDAN on this: A sham vote like that isn't going to fool anybody.

Mr. Speaker, while I think everybody knows that what is going to happen on this balanced budget amendment is really show business, I think it is important to stress that it really underlines the values of my friends on the Republican side and what they think is important and what they believe is important to protect. As I said, if this or anything like what they are proposing ever became the law of the land, programs like Social Security, like Medicare, and like Medicaid would be at risk. There are no provisions in their draft to protect these programs that so many millions of Americans rely on.

And again, this is not surprising because we have seen over the years their attempts to privatize Social Security, their attempts to privatize Medicare, their attempts to undermine Medicaid, their constant attacks on programs like SNAP. This is nothing new.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to close by saying to my Republican friends that there are some things worth defending, and programs like Social Security and programs like Medicare are worth defending. They are worth fighting for. And I want to make it clear that, on the Democratic side, any Republican attempts to undermine, to weaken, to undercut Social Security or Medicare, we will fight you. We will fight you with every ounce of energy and strength that we have because these programs are important. They are important to our values, but more importantly, they are important to our constituents.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Before us we have a rule that makes in order an important change to the banking laws. We have seen what happens when arduous regulations are removed from the backs of Americans.

Our economy is booming, growth is strong, even stronger than many expected it would be at this point.

The Volcker rule, passed under Dodd-Frank, is a solution in search of a problem. Our community banks should not have to bear the weight of this over-arching regulation. Our small town and rural lenders are active members of our communities. They participate in improving our lives in many ways, even beyond lending. They sponsor little league teams. They are boosters for the local high school. They counsel small businessmen and women. They contribute to our churches and charitable organizations. They offer help to needy neighbors.

We should actively seek policies that free them to do their jobs. That is what the underlying bill does. It exempts them from a regulation that has frozen in place their ability to invest in local startups and farming operations. We should exempt them from this burdensome regulation.

I hope this House will follow in the steps of the Financial Services Committee and approve this bill in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion. I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 811 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

In section 2(a), insert "as amended by the amendment specified in section 3 of this resolution" after "United States".

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

"Sec. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2(a) of this resolution is as follows:

'After section 7, insert the following section (and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly):

SECTION 8. EXEMPTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND MEDICAID FROM FEDERAL BALANCED BUDGET REQUIREMENT

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the following programs and any outlays resulting therefrom shall be exempt from any Federal balanced budget requirement:

(1) All Social Security benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act.

(2) Payments under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(3) Payments to States under the Medicaid program under title XIX of such Act.'"

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. MCGOVERN. 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 12 o'clock and 53 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. LAMBORN) 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 811;

Adoption of House Resolution 811, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4790, VOLCKER RULE REGULATORY HARMONIZATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 811) providing for consideration of the bill (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, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, 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 231, nays 186, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—231

Abraham	Brat	Conaway
Aderholt	Bridenstine	Cook
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cramer
Amodel	Buchanan	Crawford
Arrington	Buck	Culberson
Babin	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)
Bacon	Budd	Curtis
Banks (IN)	Burgess	Davidson
Barletta	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Calvert	Denham
Barton	Carter (GA)	Dent
Bergman	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Biggs	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Cheney	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (MI)	Coffman	Donovan
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Duffy
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Blum	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Bost	Comer	Dunn
Brady (TX)	Comstock	Emmer

Estes (KS)	LaMalfa	Rooney, Francis	McNerney	Quigley	Soto	Griffith	Marshall	Royce (CA)
Faso	Lamborn	Rooney, Thomas J.	Meeks	Raskin	Speier	Grothman	Massie	Russell
Ferguson	Lance		Meng	Rice (NY)	Suozzi	Guthrie	Mast	Rutherford
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen	Moulton	Richmond	Swalwell (CA)	Handel	McCarthy	Sanford
Fleischmann	Lewis (MN)	Roskam	Murphy (FL)	Rosen	Takano	Harper	McCauley	Scalise
Flores	LoBiondo	Ross	Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)	Harris	McClintock	Schweikert
Fortenberry	Long	Rothfus	Napolitano	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)	Hartzler	McHenry	Scott, Austin
Fox	Loudermilk	Rouzer	Neal	Ruppersberger	Titus	Hensarling	McKinley	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	Love	Royce (CA)	Nolan	Rush	Tonko	Herrera Beutler	McMorris	Sessions
Gaetz	Lucas	Roskam	Norcross	Ryan (OH)	Torres	Hice, Jody B.	Rodgers	Shimkus
Gallagher	Luetkemeyer	Rutherford	O'Halleran	Sánchez	Tsongas	Higgins (LA)	McSally	Shuster
Garrett	MacArthur	Sanford	O'Rourke	Sarbanes	Vargas	Hill	Meadows	Sinema
Gianforte	Marchant	Scalise	Pallone	Schakowsky	Veasey	Holding	Meehan	Smith (MO)
Gibbs	Marino	Schweikert	Panetta	Schiff	Vela	Hollingsworth	Messer	Smith (NE)
Gohmert	Marshall	Scott, Austin	Pascrell	Schneider	Velázquez	Huizenga	Mitchell	Smith (NJ)
Goodlatte	Massie	Sensenbrenner	Payne	Schrader	Visclosky	Hultgren	Moolenaar	Smith (TX)
Gowdy	Mast	Sessions	Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Wasserman	Hunter	Mooney (WV)	Smucker
Granger	McCarthy	Shimkus	Perlmutter	Scott, David	Schultz	Hurd	Mullin	Stefanik
Graves (GA)	McCauley	Shuster	Serrano	Sewell (AL)	Waters, Maxine	Jenkins (KS)	Newhouse	Stewart
Graves (LA)	McClintock	Smith (MO)	Peterson	Sherman	Watson Coleman	Jenkins (WV)	Noem	Stivers
Graves (MO)	McHenry	Smith (NE)	Pingree	Sinema	Welch	Johnson (LA)	Norman	Taylor
Griffith	McKinley	Smith (NJ)	Pocan	Sires	Wilson (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Nunes	Tenney
Grothman	McMorris	Smith (TX)	Polis	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth	Johnson, Sam	Olson	Thompson (PA)
Guthrie	Rodgers	Smucker	Price (NC)			Jones	Palazzo	Thornberry
Handel	McSally	Stefanik				Jordan	Palmer	Tipton
Harper	Meadows	Stewart	Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Shea-Porter	Joyce (OH)	Paulsen	Trott
Harris	Meehan	Stivers	Black	Gosar	Simpson	Katko	Pearce	Turner
Hartzler	Messer	Taylor	Cardenas	Issa	Walz	Kelly (MS)	Perry	Upton
Hensarling	Mitchell	Tenney	Castor (FL)	Moore		Kelly (PA)	Pittenger	Valadao
Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)				King (IA)	Poe (TX)	Walberg
Hice, Jody B.	Mooney (WV)	Thornberry				King (NY)	Poliquin	Walker
Higgins (LA)	Mullin	Tipton				Kinzing	Posey	Walorski
Hill	Newhouse	Trott				Knight	Ratcliffe	Walters, Mimi
Holding	Noem	Turner				Kustoff (TN)	Reed	Weber (TX)
Hollingsworth	Norman	Upton				Labrador	Reichert	Webster (FL)
Hudson	Nunes	Valadao				LaHood	Renacci	Wenstrup
Huizenga	Olson	Wagner				LaMalfa	Rice (SC)	Westerman
Hultgren	Palazzo	Walberg				Lamborn	Roe (TN)	Williams
Hunter	Palmer	Walden				Lance	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Hurd	Paulsen	Walker				Latta	Rogers (KY)	Wittman
Jenkins (KS)	Pearce	Walorski				Lewis (MN)	Rokita	Womack
Jenkins (WV)	Perry	Walters, Mimi				LoBiondo	Long	Woodall
Johnson (LA)	Pittenger	Weber (TX)				Long	Lucas	Yoder
Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Webster (FL)				Loudermilk	Luetkemeyer	Yoho
Johnson, Sam	Poliquin	Wenstrup				Love	MacArthur	Young (AK)
Jordan	Posey	Westerman				Lucas	Marchant	Young (IA)
Joyce (OH)	Ratcliffe	Williams				MacArthur	Marino	Zeldin
Katko	Reed	Wilson (SC)				Marchant		
Kelly (MS)	Reichert	Wittman				Marino		
Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Womack						
King (IA)	Rice (SC)	Woodall						
King (NY)	Roby	Yoder						
Kinzing	Roe (TN)	Yoho						
Knight	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)						
Kustoff (TN)	Rogers (KY)	Young (IA)						
Labrador	Rohrabacher	Zeldin						
LaHood	Rokita							

NOT VOTING—11

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1405

Mr. LIPINSKI changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 133.

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. MCGOVERN. 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 230, noes 184, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

AYES—230

NAYS—186		
Adams	Davis, Danny	Jeffries
Aguilar	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Barragán	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Bass	Delaney	Jones
Beatty	DeLauro	Kaptur
Bera	DelBene	Keating
Beyer	Demings	Kelly (IL)
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Kennedy
Blunt Rochester	Deutch	Khanna
Bonamici	Dingell	Kihuen
Boyle, Brendan F.	Doggett	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Doyle, Michael F.	Kilmer
Brown (MD)	Ellison	Kind
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Krishnamoorthi
Bustos	Eshoo	Kuster (NH)
Butterfield	Espallat	Langevin
Capuano	Esty (CT)	Larsen (WA)
Carbajal	Evans	Larson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Foster	Lawrence
Cartwright	Fudge	Lawson (FL)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lee
Chu, Judy	Gallago	Levin
Cicilline	Garamendi	Lewis (GA)
Clark (MA)	Gomez	Lieu, Ted
Clarke (NY)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lipinski
Clay	Gottheimer	Loebsack
Cleaver	Green, Al	Lofgren
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Lowenthal
Cohen	Grijalva	Lujan Grisham, M.
Connolly	Gutiérrez	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cooper	Hanabusa	Lynch
Correa	Hastings	Maloney, Carolyn B.
Costa	Heck	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Higgins (NY)	Matsui
Crist	Himes	McCollum
Crowley	Hoyer	McEachin
Cuellar	Huffman	McGovern
Cummings	Jackson Lee	McNerney
Davis (CA)	Jayapal	Meeks
		Meng
		Moulton
		Murphy (FL)
		Nadler
		Napolitano
		Neal
		Nolan
		Norcross
		O'Halleran
		O'Rourke
		Pallone
		Panetta
		Pascrell
		Payne
		Pelosi
		Perlmutter
		Peterson
		Pingree
		Pocan

NOES—184

Adams	Demings	Kuster (NH)
Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Langevin
Barragán	Deutch	Larsen (WA)
Bass	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Beatty	Doggett	Lawrence
Bera	Doyle, Michael F.	Lawson (FL)
Beyer	Ellison	Lee
Blumenauer	Engel	Levin
Blunt Rochester	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)
Bonamici	Espallat	Lieu, Ted
Boyle, Brendan F.	Esty (CT)	Lipinski
Brady (PA)	Evans	Loebsack
Brown (MD)	Foster	Lofgren
Brownley (CA)	Fudge	Lowenthal
Bustos	Gabbard	Lowe
Butterfield	Gallago	Lujan Grisham, M.
Capuano	Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray
Carbajal	Gomez	Lynch
Cárdenas	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Carolyn B.
Carson (IN)	Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean
Cartwright	Green, Al	Matsui
Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	McCollum
Chu, Judy	Grijalva	McEachin
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Hanabusa	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Hastings	Meeks
Clay	Heck	Meng
Cleaver	Higgins (NY)	Moulton
Clyburn	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Cohen	Hoyer	Nadler
Connolly	Huffman	Napolitano
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Neal
Correa	Jayapal	Nolan
Costa	Jeffries	Norcross
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Crist	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
Crowley	Kaptur	Pallone
Cuellar	Keating	Panetta
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Pascrell
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pascrell
Davis, Danny	Khanna	Payne
DeFazio	McCollum	Pelosi
DeGette	Kildee	Perlmutter
Delaney	Kilmer	Peterson
DeLauro	Kind	Pingree
DeBene	Krishnamoorthi	Pocan

Polis	Schneider	Titus
Price (NC)	Schrader	Tonko
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Torres
Raskin	Scott, David	Tsongas
Rice (NY)	Serrano	Vargas
Richmond	Sewell (AL)	Veasey
Rosen	Sherman	Vela
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Velázquez
Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Visclosky
Ruppersberger	Soto	Wasserman
Rush	Speier	Schultz
Ryan (OH)	Suozzi	Waters, Maxine
Sánchez	Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Takano	Welch
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (GA)	Hudson	Shea-Porter
Brady (TX)	Issa	Simpson
Castor (FL)	Moore	Walden
Frankel (FL)	Peters	Walz
Gosar	Rohrabacher	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1415

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.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 816

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON RULES.—Mrs. Torres.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRESS TEST IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 780, I call up the bill (H.R. 4293) to reform the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review process, the Dodd-Frank Act Stress Test process, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Pursuant to House Resolution

780, 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 115–63, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 115–600, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4293

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 “Stress Test Improvement Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. CCAR AND DFAST REFORMS.

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)—*
(A) in subparagraph (B)(i)—
(i) by striking “3 different” and inserting “2 different”; and
(ii) by striking “, adverse,”; and
(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) CCAR REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) LIMITATION ON QUALITATIVE CAPITAL PLANNING OBJECTIONS.—In carrying out CCAR, the Board of Governors may not object to a company’s capital plan on the basis of qualitative deficiencies in the company’s capital planning process.

“(ii) CCAR DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph and subparagraph (E), the term ‘CCAR’ means the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review established by the Board of Governors.”; and

- (2) in paragraph (2)—*
(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “semi-annual” and inserting “annual”; and
(B) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking “3 different sets of conditions, including baseline, adverse,” and inserting “2 different sets of conditions, including baseline”.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

The amendments made by this Act may not be construed to prohibit an appropriate Federal banking agency (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)) from—

- (1) ensuring the safety and soundness of an entity regulated by such an appropriate Federal banking agency; and*
- (2) ensuring compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and supervisory policies, and the following of appropriate guidance, by an entity regulated by such an appropriate Federal banking agency.*

SEC. 4. REDUCTION OF SURPLUS FUNDS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “\$7,500,000,000” and inserting “\$7,480,000,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on June 1, 2018.

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.

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 Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit 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 very strong support of H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act of 2017. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), who is a real workhorse on the Financial Services Committee and a real leader in trying to ensure that we have affordable credit for our constituents so that they can achieve the American Dream. In his legislation, he will bring clarity and reasonableness to the stress test regime.

Currently, as we know, banks face two separate, legally mandated stress tests: the CCAR and the DFAST. Together, these two programs constitute one of the greatest expansions of the Federal Reserve's supervisory powers in recent history. But what is important to note, Mr. Speaker, is that, in addition to these mandated stress tests, banks conduct stress tests every single week on one asset class or another.

It is important to know how banks can withstand tough, stormy financial weather, but this was taking place even prior to either DFAST or CCAR. What has happened now, Mr. Speaker, is these particular tests are incredibly onerous to the point where the reports are not just measured in pages, they are measured in pounds, and it is doubtful that anyone actually reads them.

Then, to compound the challenge, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve's stress tests have become kind of a cat-and-mouse exercise in which the Fed staff and compliance officers attempt to outwit each other in a game that has no rules and no transparency. In other words, it is a secret test. Nobody really knows what is on it. It is difficult for Congress, it is difficult for our markets, and it is difficult for the public to even assess whether or not these tests are effective.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important to note, if you don't know what is on the test, how can you adhere to the rule of law if you don't know what the law is? And so something really needs to change here.

Now, it is fortunate that yesterday the Federal Reserve finally took action to begin to simplify and refine the CCAR stress testing regime. Recognizing the opacity of the stress test regime, Federal Reserve Vice Chairman for Supervision Randy Quarles said in a statement: “Our regulatory measures are most effective when they are as simple and transparent as possible.” I couldn't agree more, as does the gentleman from New York as well.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this particular proposal is somewhat modest in its attempt to simplify the process. It does follow the results of a review undertaken by former Fed Chair Yellen, which found a need to reduce the burden resulting from stress testing requirements. Almost everybody agrees with that, especially on our smaller financial institutions. So that is one more reason why this is needed.

I am glad the Federal Reserve recognizes the need to reform the stress test regime because, again, it contributes to a climate of legal and regulatory uncertainty when the rule of law is so critical to the foundation of our society and it is so critical to economic growth.

But in light of the Fed's announcement yesterday, it is also important to point out what the Fed did can easily be undone next week, next month, or next year. That is why it is critical that Congress has to make improvements in the stress testing regime permanent, especially for the CCAR process, which is not—I repeat, not—a creation of statute.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) has come up again with just the right bill, H.R. 4293, and it will help provide a commonsense, and, oh, by the way, bipartisan reform that will inject badly needed accountability, transparency, and targeted relief to reduce legal and regulatory uncertainty for financial institutions.

Why is this important, Mr. Speaker? At the end of the day, it is not really the banks that are the subject of these regulations. At the end of the day, it is their customers. And what this committee and what this House has to do is ensure that there is affordable and available credit to help fund people's American Dreams.

I heard from a gentleman by the name of John in my district from Mesquite, Texas. He said:

Credit helped me obtain my first home, and 13 years later, I am still in it. It has helped us grow from one child, when we moved in, to four. We ran into some bad times, but I was able to withstand it all with the help of the available credit lines that I had at the time. Without the credit, it would have been nearly impossible to still be where me and my family are today.

That is why it is so important, Mr. Speaker. People need credit to pay their bills, to buy their homes, to pay for their car repairs; and all of these regulations, the regulatory onslaught that has been taking place for almost a decade, makes that credit less available and more expensive. It shrinks the American Dream, and we can't allow that to happen on our watch, Mr. Speaker.

That is why it is so important that we bring some rationality to the stress test so that, hopefully, people like John in Mesquite can continue to get that line of credit. Mr. Speaker, that is why it is so important that we all vote for H.R. 4293 today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act, which is designed to line Wall Street's pockets by weakening a critical tool to prevent a future financial crisis.

Bank stress tests are a forward-looking tool where a hypothetical scenario or two are tested, such as, how would a megabank fare if a major recession occurred next year with unemployment and foreclosures going way up? These tests, incredibly, are very helpful to see if banks might need to maintain more capital to help buffer against such a scenario.

□ 1430

These are similar to crash tests for cars where a manufacturer runs their cars through crash test simulations to see if passengers will remain safe in various kinds of crashes. Such testing provides valuable insights regarding what design adjustments might be needed to ensure the car is as safe as possible.

So let us take a look at how this safeguard developed. When President Obama took office, his administration inherited an economy in free fall with about 800,000 jobs lost that very month. Many wondered how many more financial firms might fail. So Treasury Secretary Geithner worked with the Federal Reserve, and together they designed the Supervisory Capital Assessment Program.

These stress tests checked how resilient the largest banks were if, in fact, the economy continued to deteriorate. Results were published, and we learned that 10 of the 19 participating firms were collectively about \$75 billion short of the required capital ratios. These tests provided criminal transparency to the market, thereby enabling the banks to begin recapitalizing themselves with new funds from investors who themselves had renewed confidence in the banking industry.

Following this success, Congress decided to mandate these stress tests to be regularly required of the Nation's largest banks in Dodd-Frank. This would ensure banks and their regulators remained vigilant, especially when times were good, so that they could spot problems much earlier and take corrective action.

The Federal Reserve implemented these Dodd-Frank stress tests alongside their Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review, known as CCAR, which added a capital planning component to the tests.

According to credit rating agencies and financial analysts, these stress tests, along with Dodd-Frank's other enhanced prudential requirements of the largest banks, have made our financial system much safer.

Now, let me give you some numbers. Since 2009, the 34 largest banks have increased their capital by \$750 billion, bringing the industry's total capital

buffer to nearly \$2 trillion today. That is \$750 billion in more high-quality funding that banks can safely lend and invest, which helps explain why business lending has also increased almost 80 percent the last 8 years.

But H.R. 4293, this bill, would undermine all of that and proposes three changes that megabanks like Wells Fargo would love to see. First, the bill would eliminate the adverse scenario from Fed-run stress tests. But like in car crash tests today, multiple scenarios can help ensure an institution can survive a wider range of unforeseen events.

Second, the bill would bar the Fed from making qualitative objections to a bank's capital plan. Even the Federal Reserve led by President Trump's appointees issued a lengthy proposal yesterday altering some of the stress testing rules, and their proposal maintains their ability to make qualitative objections. So there is no basis for Congress to unilaterally make it harder for regulators to ensure megabanks are well run and capitalized.

Third, the bill would allow Wall Street megabanks to conduct fewer company-run stress tests—annually instead of semiannually. But given how quickly tides can shift, routine, semi-annual testing can better identify problems before they grow into larger problems.

As a former Federal Reserve official wrote last year: "Had stress tests as conducted now been in place before the crisis, they could have made firms more resilient to unexpected losses, and at a minimum could have given supervisors the ability to question banks' continued dividend and share buybacks in the quarters leading to the height of the crisis."

Accordingly, I strongly urge Members to reject this rollback for Wall Street megabanks.

Let me just add by saying: Why would we do this?

Why would we, knowing what we went through in 2008 where we had this subprime meltdown, we went into a recession—almost a depression—and we discovered that the banks were undercapitalized and they could not deal with this kind of change in the economy, they could not deal with the fact that something had gone wrong and be prepared to deal with it rather than us having to bail them out in the way that we did?

I don't know why we would do this now. So I would simply ask Members to ask the question: Why is it we would take away something that would make the banks safer, that would make them more stable, and that would make them able to be able to sustain despite the fact there was a crisis developing in the economy?

Why would we want to take away this safety that we have built with stress testing?

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Members to reject this rollback for Wall Street megabanks, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), who is a hard-working member of the House Financial Services Committee and the bill's sponsor.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for all of his great leadership and mentorship throughout this process to get this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act. It is critical bipartisan legislation that injects transparency, consistency, and fairness into the stress testing process.

I especially want to thank my bipartisan supporter and partner on this important bill, Congressman DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

Stress tests are one of the aspects of current law that are contributing to the climate of legal and regulatory uncertainty because the Federal Reserve has failed to provide the necessary transparency around this process.

A stress test is a financial analysis performed internally by a financial institution or done externally by a regulator to assess if a bank can withstand stressful economic conditions. Stress tests, when done correctly, are an important way for banks and regulators to understand the ability of financial institutions to survive a contracting economy or weather a major economic storm like a recession.

Ensuring that these tests are done right, with fairness and objectivity, is essential for protecting depositors and the overall financial system. That is why passing the reforms in this bill should be a priority on both sides of the aisle.

Working together on a bipartisan basis, Mr. SCOTT offered an amendment to this bill that was accepted unanimously by the members of the Financial Services Committee, including the ranking member, and this bill cleared a committee markup with a bipartisan vote of 38–21.

By focusing the bill on three core reforms, we are improving this important process to protect soundness in the banking system, while also reforming the negative unintended consequences and damaging overreach of Dodd-Frank.

By striking the adverse scenario requirement from stress testing, these important tests can actually focus on real-world conditions to protect financial institutions and the customers they serve from threats to the stability of the financial system.

By repealing the ability of the Federal Reserve to reject a company's capital plan based solely on a qualitative stress test, we are making the process more transparent and fair.

This legislation ends the ability of regulators to arbitrarily reject a financial institution's capital plan without feedback or constructive criticism. These secretive rejections by regulators have done little to protect con-

sumers and inserted more, not less, uncertainty into the financial system.

By eliminating the midcycle review and shifting from biannual to annual stress testing requirements, we are lessening the compliance tax that has raised the cost of lending and hurt consumers who have lost access to the small business loans or mortgages that help finance their American Dream.

Without needed reform, rather than ensuring financial stability, the Federal Reserve's stress tests are likely missing real risks while constraining the competitive flow of financial services that is critical to increasing economic opportunity.

While a valuable resource, stress test results may be creating a false sense of security, while at the same time sowing the seeds of financial instability. In order to succeed, a stress test must build from an accurate forecast of the next macroeconomic storm, and even the best forecasts tend to be wrong.

The Stress Test Improvement Act will make stress testing more effective by making the rules more transparent and fair. We are not gutting standards but making them work for the real world. This bill is a bipartisan team effort to accomplish these goals.

Without transparency about what the stress testing rules are, there is no way to ensure the government plays by the rules. By subjecting financial institutions to a questionable regime that lacks accountability and transparency, regulators are failing to achieve the important goals that they are tasked with: ensuring safety and soundness.

With the critical reforms in this legislation, we are upholding sensible standards for financial institutions, while clarifying the requirements for and the frequency of stress tests.

To the hardworking men and women in my district and nationwide, it is common sense that banks ought to know the standards and tests their regulators are subjecting them to. By injecting some transparency and consistency into the stress testing regime, we are taking needed capital off the sidelines so it can be invested in the private economy to create jobs and wealth.

I want to thank Chairmen HENSARLING and LUETKEMEYER for their leadership on this important issue. I also want to thank my Democratic partner on this important bill, DAVID SCOTT.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to bank regulation, the job of the regulator is to balance the need for economic growth with the safety and soundness of the financial system. With fresh memories of the most recent financial crisis, it is natural for

regulators to err on the side of being overly cautious so they aren't blamed when something goes wrong.

Unfortunately, this has led to a situation in which regulators are evaluating stress tests based on subjective and unclear standards. The stress tests are opaque; it is like asking banks to kick a field goal when they don't even know where the goal posts are. What is more, the regulators keep ratcheting up the standards.

For the stress tests to achieve their goal, however—the goal of keeping the financial system safe and sound—they need to be transparent and they need to be fair.

H.R. 4293, a bill with bipartisan support, would approve the stress testing process for bank holding companies by repealing the ability of regulators to reject a financial institution's stress test based on subjective and opaque standards.

Another important improvement to the process would be the elimination of the overly burdensome midcycle review by shifting from biannual to annual stress testing requirements.

These reforms would make it easier for Congress, the markets, and the public to assess both the integrity of the findings of the stress tests and the effectiveness of the Fed's regulatory oversight.

Some critics, nonetheless, have claimed that this bill would weaken Dodd-Frank. On the contrary, H.R. 4293 would improve the flawed standards of Dodd-Frank and strengthen the stress testing process to ensure that it produces the results we seek: a safer and more stable financial system.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, LEE ZELDIN, and Congressman DAVID SCOTT for supporting this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I raise the question of why are we considering a bill that would reduce the amount of scrutiny that we have with this stress testing from the biggest banks in America, when, in fact, we know that this stress testing was created because of the problems that we were faced with in 2008?

We learned an awful lot about what we should not do and what we should change in order never to be in the position again where we have to bail out all of these big banks.

□ 1445

We are simply saying: Banks, you have to be tested. You have to have a stress test to see if you can withstand the difficulty that will be presented if, in fact, the economy gets in trouble. It is as simple as that.

Do you have enough capital? Are you organized in such a way that you won't go under, that you won't create a problem in our economy because of the size of your bank if you get in trouble?

So I would simply ask our Members to reject this bill because this bill is not needed. It is simply a way by which to comply with the megabanks' request to not have to do the work that is necessary to prove that they are safe. And I don't know why we would do that.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), another hardworking member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act, bipartisan legislation by my great colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

We keep hearing about megabanks, but all banks affect industries, small businesses, and large businesses. So every time we adjust the marketplace and we make more regulations, you also impact small businesses as well, and our ability to survive. As the owner of a small business, this affects me as well.

But stress testing is an important tool that can encourage the safety and soundness of an individual depository institution and the overall health of the banking system, including all banks, across all sizes and sectors. However, the Federal Reserve has implemented its stress testing in a manner that imposes unnecessary burdens without providing proportionate benefits. This is especially true for smaller institutions for which the cost of this exercise is disproportionately burdensome. It can also affect larger banks.

H.R. 4293 would fix the tests so they can properly show smarter ways to strengthen a financial institution's planning. This legislation improves the Federal Reserve's stress testing processes mandated by the Dodd-Frank Act by requiring a select group of banks, or bank holding companies, to conduct internal, company-run stress tests once a year rather than semiannually.

I want to thank Mr. ZELDIN again for sponsoring this, as always, a bipartisan piece of legislation. And it is important to note that, if we are going to reduce regulations and burdensome fees and procedures on companies, it has to be across all sectors, not just one. And I think this legislation shows that and shows the sponsor's willingness to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with Members a Communications Workers of America letter to us on H.R. 4293.

And they state: H.R. 4293 would undermine the effectiveness of the Federal Reserve's Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review—that is, CCAR—stress test. Specifically, the bill would

prohibit the Federal Reserve from objecting to a capital plan on the basis of qualitative reasons; such as, the reasonableness of the assumptions and analysis underlying the plan. The bill would also cut the frequency of CCAR tests in half, taking away tools and reducing the amount of information available to the Federal Reserve about bank health and is a fundamentally bad idea.

Really, it is basically what we have been saying. We have been saying that this would reduce the stress tests from semiannually to an annual test.

Why would you want to have less scrutiny of these banks? Why would you want to reduce the amount of time that they would have relative to being able to prove that they are safe?

Also, I think it is very important what is being said here about the Fed and the Fed's ability to basically review, on the basis of qualitative reasons, such as reasonableness and of assumptions and analyses underlying the plan.

So they are looking to see if these banks are well capitalized, if these banks can withstand, again, problems in our economy that would arise that could create unemployment and all kinds of other adverse conditions.

So I would ask the Members to oppose this bill. This is just another deregulation bill for the biggest banks in America. We should not be doing that because these are the banks that, if they are undercapitalized, if they don't have what is needed to withstand problems in our society that could arise in the economy, it could cause us to go into another recession, even a depression perhaps.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the chairman of our Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the recognition and the author of this legislation, Mr. ZELDIN, for his leadership on the Stress Test Improvement Act, which I strongly support.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve administers two stress tests that they believe analyze the ability of U.S. firms to weather various forms of economic turbulence. While the Fed failed to sound the alarm prior to the last financial crisis, the thought is that, with these tests, one of which was instituted by the Dodd-Frank financial control law in the aftermath of the financial crisis, the Fed can prevent or at least mitigate the severity of the next crisis.

I believe that stress tests can be very productive and useful, but there is such a thing as overkill. When a relatively healthy patient goes to the doctor, the doctor typically doesn't say: And you need to go to another doctor, and you need to come see me again every month. That is really not required. It adds costs, it is redundant, it is dupli-

cative, and it doesn't materially benefit the patient in terms of better health outcomes.

The analogy applies to banks. Stress testing is good, but overkill is costly, and it costs the financial system and doesn't materially add to financial stability. Certainly there is merit to stress testing, but there is no doubt that the cloud of secrecy surrounding these tests confounds the ability of financial firms to correctly identify systemic risks, to take corrective action, to chart a more sustainable or profitable path for the future. As a result, financial firms, many of them banks, are left trying to anticipate these Fed models, wasting valuable time and resources that could be used to actually address risks that threaten our economy.

So this environment of regulatory uncertainty actually, I would argue, undermines financial stability because it distracts from the mission of the institution, and it certainly is costly in terms of driving up costs and taking away access to capital for productive activities that actually strengthen the economy. For these reasons, I am a proud supporter of this bill, which is a great first step to clean up some of the regulatory uncertainties surrounding these tests.

The bill does a few things. First, it reduces the frequency of the required company-run stress tests to once per year. One is enough to identify risks, instead of two. Second, it eliminates one of the supervisory scenarios that must be run, leaving just two, again eliminating redundancy and superfluous, costly activities. Finally, it prohibits the Federal Reserve from objecting to a bank holding company's capital plan based on unknown qualitative reasons.

These institutions need to know what the Fed is looking for in order to satisfy the stress testing that is applied to them. Again, I applaud Congressman ZELDIN and Chairman HENSARLING for their hard work on this commonsense regulatory improvement bill. It is not deregulation. It is better regulation. It is more effective regulation to not only unleash greater capital under the economy but actually enhance financial stability.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the American economy and for financial stability, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Stress Test Improvement Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what this overkill argument is all about. This is about deregulation. The banks, these megabanks, don't need any more deregulation or help from Congress. In 2016, the industry made record-breaking profits, more than \$170 billion in profits. The Republicans gave the eight largest Wall Street banks a \$15 billion windfall from their tax scam bill. And CEOs are making more money on Wall

Street, as much as they made in 2006, before they drove our economy into a massive ditch.

Megabanks need reasonable but strong stress tests to keep our economy safe. And I want to tell you, after Dodd-Frank reforms were put in place—and the stress test was one of the things that had to be done—the banks resisted it, but finally they came into compliance. And it took them several years, and then they did it the way that Dodd-Frank would have them do it. So there are no problems.

These stress tests now are stress tests that reveal exactly what is going on in the bank. And so why are we trying to undo this? Why do you want to see them once a year instead of twice a year? Twice a year has proven that we can keep them straight, that we can make sure that they are well capitalized, that we can make sure they have a good financial plan.

So I would simply say, let's not get involved in more deregulation and take us back to where we were when we got in trouble in 2008. I would ask the Members to vote "no" on this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO). The gentleman from Texas has 11½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the distinguished ranking member, who observed that our banks have more capital today. And this is a good thing. To the extent that Dodd-Frank had anything to do with it, I would say congratulations to the Dodd-Frank Act. But I also noticed that, for many of us, many of our banks are still undercapitalized.

And the ranking member had every opportunity to vote for the Financial CHOICE Act that would require 10 percent, far more capital than these banks that she is concerned about failing have today, but she rejected that.

She often uses the phrase "Wall Street megabanks," but it is her side of the aisle that supports a taxpayer bailout fund for what she calls the Wall Street megabanks. That comes from our friends on that side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker; not on this side. She says we have to bail out these banks.

No, we don't have to. We don't have to. We should support bankruptcy over bailout. And we should support high levels of capital over incredibly intrusive Federal control, Federal control that ultimately gets resolved into less credit and more expensive credit for many of our constituents.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would add, banks have stress-tested themselves long before the appearance of Dodd-Frank. Long before the appearance of Dodd-Frank. In fact, stress tests are taking place on some group of assets at

every bank in America every day. Many, many banks, particularly the larger banks, may do up to 200 stress tests a week.

What the gentleman from New York is trying to do is add some level of clarity, sanity, and reasonableness to the federally instituted CCAR process, something that can take literally 40,000 pages—40,000 pages—can take tens of millions, if not over \$100 million, to produce that could have been used to loan to our constituents to buy their home, to repair their car, to put groceries on the table, to pay for their healthcare premiums.

□ 1500

And some say, well, these tests have to be conducted semiannually. Why semiannually? What is wrong with annually? What is sacrosanct about semiannually? And, oh, by the way, why are we testing for both worst-case scenario and some mid-scenario?

Okay. Either you are going to survive the 100-year flood or you are not. If you can survive the 100-year flood, surely you can survive the 50-year flood. So why do we need that other test?

I mean, what we hear from our friends on the other side of aisle: Oh, my God, we can't question the Federal regulators. I mean, they come from Mount Olympus. They have this great wisdom that we can never challenge them.

Well, the truth is we are Article I of the Constitution, and we are the ones who make the law, and that is why we have hearings, and we listen very closely. We listen closely to our regulators; we listen closely to our constituents; we listen closely to market participants; and then we make judgments. We make judgments.

So, yes, there is a balance. There is a balance between economic opportunity and financial stability. We want there to be strong financial stability, but we also want there to be strong, strong economic opportunity for all of our constituents.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with Members the opinions of former Chair Janet Yellen, who has stated that stress testing improves public understanding of risk at large banking firms, provides a forward-looking examination of firms' potential losses, and has contributed to significant improvement in risk management.

Former Chair Ben Bernanke has praised stress testing for playing a crucial role in the recovery of the economy and creating a more resilient postcrisis U.S. banking system.

The deceptively named Stress Test Improvement Act—that is, this bill—severely weakens this key element of bank oversight and must be rejected. We cannot ignore the analyses that are

being given by these former Fed Chairs. I mean, they are saying do not be tricked, do not be fooled, that this is a deceptive bill, and that stress testing must continue in order to ensure the stability of our banks in the event the economy goes awry.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), the Democratic cosponsor of this legislation and a proud member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING and my distinguished ranking member, who has some very serious concerns.

I want to take a moment to explain that the bill is basically my bipartisan amendment that Mr. ZELDIN and I worked on that passed in committee, and I think it is very important for me to work through this to explain how it will not affect as my ranking member has stated. However, I want to make sure that people know we have got things in here to address.

It keeps intact the essence of what we were trying to accomplish with stress tests in Dodd-Frank. Now, my amendment essentially rewrote this bill, as I said, so that we are left with just three simple things, tweaks that we are making.

The first one is, in today's CCAR test, banks are now required to run stress tests that have, one, a baseline, adverse, and severely adverse scenario. My amendment simply removes the adverse requirement.

And why is that? Because, in talking about how we can stimulate more growth for our banks while at the same time maintaining the proper stress test, we heard that the adverse scenario rarely proved or shed any light on the health of the bank that isn't already shown when testing a bank for a severely adverse scenario. So we didn't need the other one if one is doing it, and so we eliminated that.

Secondly, my amendment eliminated the Fed's ability to reject a capital plan solely on what we refer to as the qualitative portion of the test. Now, Mr. Speaker, we did this because stress tests are tests of both the bank's books, which is the quantitative side, and a test of the bank's internal controls, which is the qualitative side. So rejecting a capital plan solely on the qualitative portion of the test generates a lot of uncertainty within our banking system for banks, and it is something that the Federal regulators already, earlier last year, stopped requiring the banks under \$250 million from having to do. So we simply removed that.

And then, lastly, my amendment eliminated the midyear tests that banks are required to do internally. Why did we do that? Because right now, if you are a bank above a certain

asset size, you are required to do internal tests. My amendment just changes this so that the tests are done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues who are looking at this that I very carefully listened to my ranking member, and I have made sure, when we worked it in the process, that we adhered to that. No phase of this stress test is eliminated.

And the thing I want to add, over in the Senate, in the reg bill, S. 2155, two of the three parts of this bill and my amendment are already captured in S. 2155, which received 67 bipartisan votes.

So it is with gracious affection to my ranking member, because oftentimes we have to work together, and respect to my chairman that I urge all our Members, both Democrats and Republicans, to support this very important and worthwhile 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), who served as our vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise to express my support for H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act.

I also want to commend my colleague Representative ZELDIN for his work on this important issue.

Those of us who travel our districts to speak with the men and women who work at financial institutions are well aware of the high costs and lack of clarity in the stress test process. Companies are being forced to dedicate substantial resources and immense amounts of time to go through the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review, or CCAR, and the Dodd-Frank Act Stress Tests, DFAST.

I have spoken to compliance staff who reported submissions in the tens of thousands of pages. For each dollar or staffer put towards CCAR or DFAST, there are fewer resources being dedicated to innovation or helping customers.

Of course, we all believe that stress tests can and should be useful experiences. Some of the information turned up in stress tests could be helpful, but we are desperately in need to enact meaningful reform to provide better transparency, clarity, and reduce undue burden.

Columbia University Professor Charles Calomiris described the process as one in which “regulators punish banks for failing to meet standards that are never stated.” Let me repeat

that: “. . . failing to meet standards that are never stated.” It is sort of a Kafkaesque creature of our bureaucracy.

Zeldin’s bill improves the stress testing process by requiring the Federal Reserve to follow regular notice-and-comment practices and issue clear regulations on economic conditions and methodologies and to assess the effectiveness of the Fed’s models. It also alleviates the compliance burden on firms by spacing out CCARs and DFASTs. These are targeted, reasonable reforms that can greatly improve the process. This will enhance, not hurt, financial stability and leave us with a healthier more vibrant economy.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support the Stress Test Improvement Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to focus on pushing through giveaways to Wall Street and megabanks like Wells Fargo that could be harmful to consumers, investors, and our Nation’s economy. Week after week, Republicans advance legislation that is basically reckless and misguided. H.R. 4293 is yet another bad bill from the Republicans that weakens critical protections put in place by Democrats to prevent another financial crisis.

As we have discussed, the bill undermines the stress test framework for our Nation’s largest banks. Stress tests are an important regulatory tool that have much improved the safety of our financial system.

Mr. Speaker, when we crafted Dodd-Frank, we mandated these stress tests and put in place other enhanced prudential guardrails for large banks to not only prevent damage to our economy, but also help grow our economy, and they are working. H.R. 4293 weakens the rigor and frequency of these stress tests, a move that simply makes no sense.

Rather than harmful measures such as this one, Congress should be working to strengthen consumer protections, reform our broken system of credit reporting, provide tailored, responsible relief for community banks, and ensure that recidivist megabanks are held accountable for breaking the law.

I urge a “no” vote on this bill, and I urge Members again to simply ask the question: Why, at this point in time, would we want to basically reduce the ability for us to know exactly what is going on in those banks, whether or not they are fully capitalized, whether or not they could withstand a serious problem in our economy?

I don’t think that the opposite side of the aisle, my friends, could really an-

swer that question because this is simply a deregulatory bill for the biggest banks in America, for the megabanks, not needed, and certainly we need the information. We never want to go through a period of time like we did in 2008 where we discovered that our banks were not well capitalized and could not withstand the problems that we encountered.

I simply ask all Members to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Well, the ranking member poses the question, “Why?” I can tell you why, Mr. Speaker. It is because Therese from Waco has written:

I would like to express my disappointment at being rejected for a home loan, which would cost less than the house I presently have been renting for 5 years. As a small-business owner, I run my design studio out of my home office and take every tax break that is legal to offset the taxes payable if I didn’t.

We do it for Sherry from Eustace, who writes:

After a divorce 4 years ago, I needed to buy a car because my car was over 10 years old. I have a checking account in my name, I have a savings account, but they did not loan me money.

There is an onslaught of financial regulations that is costly, intrusive, burdensome, and is causing credit to be less available—less available—to the people who need it. That is why we do this, Mr. Speaker, week after week after week. We do it to make sure that our constituents can buy homes, that they can have cars. If they have tough times, if they lose a job, if they go through a painful divorce, that is why we do it, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1515

Again, stress-tests are important. That is why banks do it themselves every single week.

But the question is: How do we calibrate this?

We have used the ranking member’s prescription, and that of my friends on the other side of the aisle, and it brought us 1.6 percent economic growth. Thankfully, today, with a new Congress and with a new President, we have 3 percent economic growth, and all types of opportunities are coming.

We should not listen and go back to those days. It is time to go forward to a better America with greater opportunity for all Americans. That means we have to reform the stress test to ensure that not only do we have financial stability, but we have financial opportunity as well. That is the work of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to support H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act of 2017, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 780, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. In its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Maxine Waters of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4293 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike "and".

Page 2, line 14, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 2, after line 14, insert the following:

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN GSIB BAD ACTORS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The following shall apply to any global systemically important bank holding company and any subsidiary thereof, if such global systemically important bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof has engaged in a pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other violations related to consumer harm:

“(i) The Board of Governors shall provide for an additional adverse set of condition under paragraph (1)(B)(i) for the evaluation required by paragraph (1).

“(ii) Subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) shall not apply.

“(iii) The stress tests required by paragraph (2)(A) shall be required semiannually.

“(iv) In issuing regulations under paragraph (2)(C), each Federal primary financial regulatory agency shall establish methodologies for the conduct of stress tests required by paragraph (2) that shall provide for an additional adverse set of condition.

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph:

“(i) FEDERAL CONSUMER FINANCIAL LAW.—The term ‘Federal consumer financial law’ has the meaning given that term under section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

“(ii) GLOBAL SYSTEMICALLY IMPORTANT BANK HOLDING COMPANY.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘global systemically important bank holding company’ means—

“(aa) a bank holding company that has been identified by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as a global systemically important bank holding company pursuant to section 217.402 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(bb) a global systemically important foreign banking organization, as defined under section 252.2 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(II) TREATMENT OF EXISTING GSIBS.—A company or organization described under clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A) on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed a global systemically important

bank holding company for purposes of this Act.

“(iii) PATTERN OR PRACTICE OF UNSAFE OR UNSOUND BANKING PRACTICES AND OTHER VIOLATIONS RELATED TO CONSUMER HARM.—The term ‘pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other violations related to consumer harm’ means engaging in all of the following activities, to the extent each activity was discovered or occurred at least once in the 10 years preceding the date of the enactment of this Act:

“(I) Having unsafe or unsound practices in the institution’s risk management and oversight of the institution’s sales practices, as evidenced by—

“(aa) an institution lacking an enterprise-wide sales practices oversight program that enables the institution to adequately monitor sales practices to prevent and detect unsafe or unsound sales practices and mitigate risks that may result from such unsafe and unsound sales practices; and

“(bb) an institution lacking a comprehensive customer complaint monitoring process that—

“(AA) enables the institution to assess customer complaint activity across the institution;

“(BB) adequately monitors, manages, and reports on customer complaints; and

“(CC) analyzes and understands the potential risks posed by the institution’s sales practices.

“(II) Engaging in unsafe and unsound sales practices, as evidenced by the institution—

“(aa) opening more than one million unauthorized deposit, credit card, or other accounts;

“(bb) performing unauthorized transfers of customer funds; and

“(cc) performing unauthorized credit inquiries for purposes of the conduct described in clause (i) or (ii).

“(III) Lacking adequate oversight of third-party vendors for purposes of risk-mitigation, to prevent abusive and deceptive practices in the vendor’s provision of consumer products or services.

“(IV) Having deficient policies and procedures for sharing customers’ personal identifiable information with third-party vendors for litigation purposes that led to inadvertent disclosure of such information to unintended parties.

“(V) Violating Federal consumer financial laws with respect to mortgage loans, including charges of hidden fees and unauthorized or improper disclosures tied to home mortgage loan modifications.

“(VI) Engaging in unsafe or unsound banking practices related to residential mortgage loan servicing and foreclosure processing.

“(VII) Violating the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.”.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be waived.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked at length about how H.R. 4293 is a bill for

Wall Street megabanks to line their pockets while reducing safeguards that better protect the Main Street economy from another financial crisis. While I deeply disagree with the bill’s approach, I offer this motion to recommit, not in a manner that sends the bill to the committee and kills the bill, but rather to attempt to improve the bill before the House votes on final passage of the measure.

We all know megabanks have been given a free ride in Washington for far too long when it comes to repeated, egregious offenses. They just get a fine—the equivalent of a slap on the wrist—for harming consumers.

Since 2010, megabanks have racked up over \$160 billion worth of fines, yet they keep breaking the law.

We have talked about Wells Fargo’s growing list of illegal actions that have harmed millions of consumers. Sure they have been fined, but these fines, even \$1 billion in fines, are just the cost of doing business for a company that made over \$22 billion in profit in 2017. This soft enforcement approach is just increasing their operational risk and losses, which, at the end of the day, will impact not only all of their consumers, but the broader economy as well.

I hope Republicans and Democrats can all agree that any megabank that engages in a pattern or practice of unsafe or unsound banking practices and other egregious violations that has resulted in profound consumer harm in the last 10 years is not entitled to any benefit of regulatory relief provided under this bill, especially regulatory relief that would eliminate the type of oversight that makes sure our economy stays safe. So my amendment would exclude a megabank like Wells Fargo that has fraudulently opened millions of accounts without their customers’ consent, enrolled consumers in life insurance policies without their consent, and forced nearly 1 million Americans to purchase auto insurance they didn’t need.

Since 2016, I have been calling for Wells Fargo to face real penalties. I introduced H.R. 3937, the Megabank Accountability and Consequences Act, to compel the Federal bank regulators to fully utilize existing authorities to stop megabanks from repeatedly flouting the law and harming millions of consumers. So I was glad to see Janet Yellen, on her last day at the Fed, take bold action to cap the bank’s size until it cleans up its act.

We must do more to send a strong message to all megabanks that there will be real consequences for their bad actions that mislead, abuse, or deceive its customers. H.R. 4293, in its current form, would send the opposite message to recidivist megabanks and undermine the hard work we have done since the 2007–2009 financial crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this motion to recommit so that we do not reward a recidivist megabank like Wells Fargo for repeated operational failures that ripped

off millions of consumers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member talks about the hundreds of millions of dollars of fines that these banks have paid, who have violated provisions of civil law, maybe that means the system is working. That is what ought to happen to wrongdoers. There ought to be fines.

No one can defend what happened at Wells Fargo. I hope that the current management team is cleaning up what has been a mess and what has harmed consumers for many, many years under the previous team.

But I do know this: that Wells Fargo has been fined almost a half a billion dollars already. Their former CEO had \$75 million clawed back in compensation. They lost \$29 billion of market value—their investors—and investigations are ongoing, as it well should be.

But I would point out that our prudential regulators continue to have full authority to enforce all of our consumer protection laws: the Alternative Mortgage Transaction Parity Act, the Consumer Leasing Act, the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and the Fair Credit Billing Act. When they find violations, people are fined, as they well should be.

But what we are talking about, once again, is trying to create economic opportunity for all those who need it, to make credit more available and less expensive for people who are trying to buy a home, repair a car, and put groceries on the table.

What the gentleman from New York is saying, again, when it comes to a federally imposed stress test, after hours and hours of testimony, we believe that maybe that test ought to be administered annually, instead of semiannually. That would be a better balance. That is what is happening from the gentleman from New York.

What the ranking member's motion to recommit would do is simply water that down when all of our consumer protection laws remain fully in effect. They are working.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the motion to recommit, I urge adoption of H.R. 4293, the Stress Test Improvement Act, from Mr. ZELDIN from New York.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. 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.

FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 780, I call up the bill (H.R. 4061) to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 780, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-64, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-600, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4061

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. SIFI DESIGNATION PROCESS.

Section 113 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5323) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (J), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (K) as subparagraph (L); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

"(K) the appropriateness of the imposition of prudential standards as opposed to other forms of regulation to mitigate the identified risks; and";

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (J), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (K) as subparagraph (L);

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

"(K) the appropriateness of the imposition of prudential standards as opposed to other forms of regulation to mitigate the identified risks; and"; and

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) REEVALUATION AND RESCISSION.—

"(1) ANNUAL REEVALUATION.—Not less frequently than annually, the Council shall reevaluate each determination made under subsections (a) and (b) with respect to a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors and shall—

"(A) provide written notice to the nonbank financial company being reevaluated and afford such company an opportunity to submit written materials, within such time as the Council determines to be appropriate (but which shall be not less than 30 days after the date of receipt by the company of such notice), to contest the determination, including materials concerning whether, in the company's view, material financial distress at the company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of the company

could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States;

"(B) provide an opportunity for the nonbank financial company to meet with the Council to present the information described in subparagraph (A); and

"(C) if the Council does not rescind the determination, provide notice to the nonbank financial company, its primary financial regulatory agency and the primary financial regulatory agency of any of the company's significant subsidiaries of the reasons for the Council's decision, which notice shall address with specificity how the Council assessed the material factors presented by the company under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

"(2) PERIODIC REEVALUATION.—

"(A) REVIEW.—Every 5 years after the date of a final determination with respect to a nonbank financial company under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, the nonbank financial company may submit a written request to the Council for a reevaluation of such determination. Upon receipt of such a request, the Council shall conduct a reevaluation of such determination and hold a vote on whether to rescind such determination.

"(B) PROCEDURES.—Upon receipt of a written request under paragraph (A), the Council shall fix a time (not earlier than 30 days after the date of receipt of the request) and place at which such company may appear, personally or through counsel, to—

"(i) submit written materials (which may include a plan to modify the company's business, structure, or operations, which shall specify the length of the implementation period); and

"(ii) provide oral testimony and oral argument before the members of the Council.

"(C) TREATMENT OF PLAN.—If the company submits a plan in accordance with subparagraph (B)(i), the Council shall consider whether the plan, if implemented, would cause the company to no longer meet the standards for a final determination under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable. The Council shall provide the nonbank financial company an opportunity to revise the plan after consultation with the Council.

"(D) EXPLANATION FOR CERTAIN COMPANIES.—With respect to a reevaluation under this paragraph where the determination being reevaluated was made before the date of enactment of this paragraph, the nonbank financial company may require the Council, as part of such reevaluation, to explain with specificity the basis for such determination.

"(3) RESCISSION OF DETERMINATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Council, by a vote of not fewer than 2/3 of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, determines under this subsection that a nonbank financial company no longer meets the standards for a final determination under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, the Council shall rescind such determination.

"(B) APPROVAL OF COMPANY PLAN.—Approval by the Council of a plan submitted or revised in accordance with paragraph (2) shall require a vote of not fewer than 2/3 of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson. If such plan is approved by the Council, the company shall implement the plan during the period identified in the plan, except that the Council, in its sole discretion and upon request from the company, may grant one or more extensions of the implementation period. After the end of the implementation period, including any extensions granted by the Council, the Council shall proceed to a vote as described under subparagraph (A)."

(4) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSED DETERMINATION, NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING, AND FINAL DETERMINATION.—

"(1) NOTICE OF IDENTIFICATION FOR INITIAL EVALUATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR VOLUNTARY SUBMISSION.—Upon identifying a nonbank financial company for comprehensive analysis of

the potential for the nonbank company to pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States, the Council shall provide the nonbank financial company with—

“(A) written notice that explains with specificity the basis for so identifying the company, a copy of which shall be provided to the company’s primary financial regulatory agency;

“(B) an opportunity to submit written materials for consideration by the Council as part of the Council’s initial evaluation of the risk profile and characteristics of the company;

“(C) an opportunity to meet with the Council to discuss the Council’s analysis; and

“(D) a list of the public sources of information being considered by the Council as part of such analysis.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS BEFORE MAKING A PROPOSED DETERMINATION.—Before making a proposed determination with respect to a nonbank financial company under paragraph (3), the Council shall—

“(A) by a vote of not fewer than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, approve a resolution that identifies with specificity any risks to the financial stability of the United States the Council has identified relating to the nonbank financial company;

“(B) with respect to nonbank financial company with a primary financial regulatory agency, provide a copy of the resolution described under subparagraph (A) to the primary financial regulatory agency and provide such agency with at least 180 days from the receipt of the resolution to—

“(i) consider the risks identified in the resolution; and

“(ii) provide a written response to the Council that includes its assessment of the risks identified and the degree to which they are or could be addressed by existing regulation and, as appropriate, issue proposed regulations or undertake other regulatory action to mitigate the identified risks;

“(C) provide the nonbank financial company with written notice that the Council—

“(i) is considering whether to make a proposed determination with respect to the nonbank financial company under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, which notice explains with specificity the basis for the Council’s consideration, including any aspects of the company’s operations or activities that are a primary focus for the Council; or

“(ii) has determined not to subject the company to further review, which action shall not preclude the Council from issuing a notice to the company under subparagraph (1)(A) at a future time; and

“(D) in the case of a notice to the nonbank financial company under subparagraph (C)(i), provide the company with—

“(i) an opportunity to meet with the Council to discuss the Council’s analysis;

“(ii) an opportunity to submit written materials, within such time as the Council deems appropriate (but not less than 30 days after the date of receipt by the company of the notice described under clause (i)), to the Council to inform the Council’s consideration of the nonbank financial company for a proposed determination, including materials concerning the company’s views as to whether it satisfies the standard for determination set forth in subsection (a) or (b), as applicable;

“(iii) an explanation of how any request by the Council for information from the nonbank financial company relates to potential risks to the financial stability of the United States and the Council’s analysis of the company;

“(iv) written notice when the Council deems its evidentiary record regarding such nonbank financial company to be complete; and

“(v) an opportunity to meet with the members of the Council.

“(3) PROPOSED DETERMINATION.—

“(A) VOTING.—The Council may, by a vote of not fewer than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the voting members then

serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, propose to make a determination in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, with respect to a nonbank financial company.

“(B) DEADLINE FOR MAKING A PROPOSED DETERMINATION.—With respect to a nonbank financial company provided with a written notice under paragraph (2)(C)(i), if the Council does not provide the company with the written notice of a proposed determination described under paragraph (4) within the 180-day period following the date on which the Council notifies the company under paragraph (2)(C) that the evidentiary record is complete, the Council may not make such a proposed determination with respect to such company unless the Council repeats the procedures described under paragraph (2).

“(C) REVIEW OF ACTIONS OF PRIMARY FINANCIAL REGULATORY AGENCY.—With respect to a nonbank financial company with a primary financial regulatory agency, the Council may not vote under subparagraph (A) to make a proposed determination unless—

“(i) the Council first determines that any proposed regulations or other regulatory actions taken by the primary financial regulatory agency after receipt of the resolution described under paragraph (2)(A) are insufficient to mitigate the risks identified in the resolution;

“(ii) the primary financial regulatory agency has notified the Council that the agency has no proposed regulations or other regulatory actions to mitigate the risks identified in the resolution; or

“(iii) the period allowed by the Council under paragraph (2)(B) has elapsed and the primary financial regulatory agency has taken no action in response to the resolution.

“(4) NOTICE OF PROPOSED DETERMINATION.—The Council shall—

“(A) provide to a nonbank financial company written notice of a proposed determination of the Council, including an explanation of the basis of the proposed determination of the Council, that a nonbank financial company shall be supervised by the Board of Governors and shall be subject to prudential standards in accordance with this title, an explanation of the specific risks to the financial stability of the United States presented by the nonbank financial company, and a detailed explanation of why existing regulations or other regulatory action by the company’s primary financial regulatory agency, if any, is insufficient to mitigate such risk; and

“(B) provide the primary financial regulatory agency of the nonbank financial company a copy of the nonpublic written explanation of the Council’s proposed determination.

“(5) HEARING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of any notice of a proposed determination under paragraph (4), the nonbank financial company may request, in writing, an opportunity for a written or oral hearing before the Council to contest the proposed determination, including the opportunity to present a plan to modify the company’s business, structure, or operations in order to mitigate the risks identified in the notice, and which plan shall also include any steps the company expects to take during the implementation period to mitigate such risks.

“(B) GRANT OF HEARING.—Upon receipt of a timely request, the Council shall fix a time (not earlier than 30 days after the date of receipt of the request) and place at which such company may appear, personally or through counsel, to—

“(i) submit written materials (which may include a plan to modify the company’s business, structure, or operations); or

“(ii) provide oral testimony and oral argument to the members of the Council.

“(6) COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF COMPANY PLAN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a nonbank financial company submits a plan in accordance with

paragraph (5), the Council shall, prior to making a final determination—

“(i) consider whether the plan, if implemented, would mitigate the risks identified in the notice under paragraph (4); and

“(ii) provide the nonbank financial company an opportunity to revise the plan after consultation with the Council.

“(B) VOTING.—Approval by the Council of a plan submitted under paragraph (5) or revised under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall require a vote of not fewer than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson.

“(C) IMPLEMENTATION OF APPROVED PLAN.—With respect to a nonbank financial company’s plan approved by the Council under subparagraph (B), the company shall have one year to implement the plan, except that the Council, in its sole discretion and upon request from the nonbank financial company, may grant one or more extensions of the implementation period.

“(D) OVERSIGHT OF IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(i) PERIODIC REPORTS.—The Council, acting through the Office of Financial Research, may require the submission of periodic reports from a nonbank financial company for the purpose of evaluating the company’s progress in implementing a plan approved by the Council under subparagraph (B).

“(ii) INSPECTIONS.—The Council may direct the primary financial regulatory agency of a nonbank financial company or its subsidiaries (or, if none, the Board of Governors) to inspect the company or its subsidiaries for the purpose of evaluating the implementation of the company’s plan.

“(E) AUTHORITY TO RESCIND APPROVAL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—During the implementation period described under subparagraph (C), including any extensions granted by the Council, the Council shall retain the authority to rescind its approval of the plan if the Council finds, by a vote of not fewer than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, that the company’s implementation of the plan is no longer sufficient to mitigate or prevent the risks identified in the resolution described under paragraph (2)(A).

“(ii) FINAL DETERMINATION VOTE.—The Council may proceed to a vote on final determination under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, not earlier than 10 days after providing the nonbank financial company with written notice that the Council has rescinded the approval of the company’s plan pursuant to clause (i).

“(F) ACTIONS AFTER IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(i) EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION.—After the end of the implementation period described under subparagraph (C), including any extensions granted by the Council, the Council shall consider whether the plan, as implemented by the nonbank financial company, adequately mitigates or prevents the risks identified in the resolution described under paragraph (2)(A).

“(ii) VOTING.—If, after performing an evaluation under clause (i), not fewer than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the voting members of the Council then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, determine that the plan, as implemented, adequately mitigates or prevents the identified risks, the Council shall not make a final determination under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, with respect to the nonbank financial company and shall notify the company of the Council’s decision to take no further action.

“(7) FINAL COUNCIL DECISIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of a hearing under paragraph (5), the Council shall notify the nonbank financial company of—

“(i) a final determination under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable;

“(ii) the Council’s approval of a plan submitted by the nonbank financial company under paragraph (5) or revised under paragraph (6); or

“(iii) the Council’s decision to take no further action with respect to the nonbank financial company.

“(B) EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.—A final determination of the Council, under subsection (a) or (b), shall contain a statement of the basis for the decision of the Council, including the reasons why the Council rejected any plan by the nonbank financial company submitted under paragraph (5) or revised under paragraph (6).”

“(C) NOTICE TO PRIMARY FINANCIAL REGULATORY AGENCY.—In the case of a final determination under subsection (a) or (b), the Council shall provide the primary financial regulatory agency of the nonbank financial company a copy of the nonpublic written explanation of the Council’s final determination.”;

(5) in subsection (g), strike “before the Council makes any final determination” and insert “from the outset of the Council’s consideration of the company, including before the Council makes any proposed or final determination”;

and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—The Council shall—

“(1) in each case where a nonbank financial company has been notified that it is subject to the Council’s review and the company has publicly disclosed such fact, confirm that the nonbank financial company is subject to the Council’s review, in response to a request from a third party;

“(2) upon making a final determination, publicly provide a written explanation of the basis for its decision with sufficient detail to provide the public with an understanding of the specific bases of the Council’s determination, including any assumptions related thereof, subject to the requirements of section 112(d)(5);

“(3) include, in the annual report required by section 112, the number of nonbank financial companies from the previous year subject to preliminary analysis, further review, and subject to a proposed or final determination; and

“(4) within 90 days after the enactment of this subsection, publish information regarding its methodology for calculating any quantitative thresholds or other metrics used to identify nonbank financial companies for analysis by the Council.

“(k) PERIODIC ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF DESIGNATIONS.—

“(1) ASSESSMENT.—Every five years after the date of enactment of this section, the Council shall—

“(A) conduct a study of the Council’s determinations that nonbank financial companies shall be supervised by the Board of Governors and shall be subject to prudential standards; and

“(B) comprehensively assess the impact of such determinations on the companies for which such determinations were made and the wider economy, including whether such determinations are having the intended result of improving the financial stability of the United States.

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after completing a study required under paragraph (1), the Council shall issue a report to the Congress that—

“(A) describes all findings and conclusions made by the Council in carrying out such study; and

“(B) identifies whether any of the Council’s determinations should be rescinded or whether related regulations or regulatory guidance should be modified, streamlined, expanded, or repealed.”.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

None of the amendments made by this Act may be construed as limiting the Financial Stability Oversight Council’s emergency powers under section 113(f) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5323(f)).

SEC. 4. REDUCTION OF SURPLUS FUNDS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “\$7,500,000,000” and inserting “\$7,451,428,571”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on June 1, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit 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. 4061, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act of 2017.

I want to commend two friends, Mr. ROSS from Florida on the Republican side of the aisle and Mr. DELANEY on the Democrat side of the aisle, for their collective leadership on bringing forth this truly bipartisan bill, a strong, bipartisan bill, which has 58 different cosponsors, half from each side of the aisle.

Before talking a bit about the bill, there has been a lot of news today, Mr. Speaker. Part of the news, that I just could not overlook, is the fact that my dear friend and colleague from Florida announced that he would be retiring at the end of this Congress. I do want to say what a pleasure and honor it has been to work with the gentleman from Florida. I have appreciated his leadership, I have appreciated his knowledge, and I have appreciated his calm demeanor and his ability to further strong, bipartisan measures that will help create greater credit opportunities for hardworking Americans. I would say I will miss him, but I will be gone as well. Maybe he will invite me down to the Florida coast for some deep sea fishing. I look forward to receiving that invitation at the appropriate time.

Now back to business, Mr. Speaker.

The Financial Stability Oversight Council is charged with identifying emerging threats to our financial stability. However, during the previous administration, the FSOC, as it is called, went far beyond identifying this risk and, instead, just concocted incredibly irrational speculative scenarios about sectors of the financial markets that had nothing to do with the financial crisis. In turn, they have caused more harm to the financial system than added stability.

It bears highlighting at the outset that this bill does not strip the FSOC of its ability to designate a nonbank financial company as a SIFI, or systemically important financial institution. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it would be

a better bill if it did. It also wouldn’t be a bipartisan bill. That is not what this bill is trying to do. Rather, this bill simply brings needed transparency and accountability to the designation process.

Mr. ROSS and Mr. DELANEY, in H.R. 4061, do this by reversing the presumption that government bureaucrats should dictate the business models and operational objectives of private businesses in requiring the FSOC to approach the potential designation of a nonbank by encouraging companies to address the risk prior to designating them as SIFIs in order to actually reduce systemic risk.

Let me sum it up, Mr. Speaker. All this is saying is that a nonbank financial institution that the Financial Stability Oversight Council feels may be creating undue risk in the system, give them an opportunity to remedy that before you designate them as a too-big-to-fail institution backed up with a taxpayer bailout fund. At least give them an opportunity to remedy the risk that you are concerned about.

What could be more common sense? What could be more reasonable? That is why it is such a strong, bipartisan bill coming out of the House Financial Services Committee.

□ 1530

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, applying bank-like regulation to nonbanks, such as asset managers, broker-dealers, insurance companies, and private investment funds just doesn’t make sense. Nonbanks do not have access to the deposit insurance fund, they don’t have access to the Federal Reserve’s discount window or lending facilities. Nonbanks take far larger capital haircuts on the assets they hold. Nonbanks, when they fail, fail very differently from banks.

If an individual mutual fund were to fail, the shareholders of that fund would bear the losses, not the taxpayer. There is no reason to apply the same system to them.

So the bill would bring, again, clarity and accountability to the FSOC designation process. That should be self-evident.

To date, the FSOC has designated four nonbank financial companies as systemically important financial institutions. Today, only one remains designated and it is unclear for exactly how long.

The de-designation of these companies seems to point to a recognition that these companies do not present a potential risk that FSOC first claimed that they did. MetLife, one of them, actually challenged FSOC’s SIFI determination in court, and FSOC’s designation was found by an Article III judge to be fatally flawed, arbitrary and capricious, and a critical departure from FSOC’s own standards.

Based on that case alone, it certainly seems appropriate for Congress to ensure there are proper guardrails put in place in this designation, because at

the end of the day, the designation doesn't just affect, again, Wall Street, it is felt directly by Main Street households who are trying to save for college, save for retirement. They would see their costs rise and their investment returns fall on a mutual fund if it was designated, simply because investors would be required to bail out other too-big-to-fail firms.

So this is a common sense piece of legislation, it is strongly bipartisan, and I urge all Members to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4061, the so-called Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act.

The bill would recklessly complicate the process used by the Financial Stability Oversight Council, also referred to as FSOC, to designate nonbank firms for heightened oversight and protect the economy.

The bill would also give companies more avenues to delay by at least 4 years or block these designations even when the designations are warranted.

According to former Treasury Secretary Lew, who previously chaired FSOC and strongly opposed this bill last Congress: "An extensively long 4-year process to designate large, complex firms that pose significant risk to the financial system is not an improvement; instead, it would effectively render meaningless one of the most important tools we in future councils should have to address threats to financial stability."

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office confirmed this view, finding that H.R. 4061 would increase the risk that undesignated systemic nonbank firms will fail.

Let me be very clear: This bill is a thinly veiled attempt to hinder and needlessly delay FSOC's existing ability to designate firms for heightened oversight.

Americans for Financial Reform has also underscored that this bill would: "Provide giant, global financial firms numerous opportunities to use insider lobbying and the courts to delay or prevent actions that banking regulators are attempting to take to safeguard economic stability."

One of the reasons Congress created FSOC was to make sure that large, interconnected firms like Bear Stearns, AIG, or Lehman Brothers would never again devastate the stability of our financial system and jeopardize our country's strong economy with their risky practices and relentless demand for profits over safe and sound operations.

So I simply cannot support this bill, which would add hurdles to prevent FSOC from fulfilling its vital role of identifying interconnected, huge companies that warrant enhanced safeguards.

I also reject the myths Republicans continue to spread about the Dodd-Frank Act in their effort to roll back so many of its critical reforms. The majority has claimed that Dodd-Frank has caused tremendous burden on the financial industry and resulted in lenders denying affordable access to credit to consumers and families, but the numbers tell the real story of the success of Dodd-Frank and the need to maintain its regulatory regime, including the FSOC. Why? Because bank profits and share prices have skyrocketed and are now far above pre-recession heights.

In addition, business lending has increased 80 percent and community banks are doing well.

What is more, pay for bank executives is through the roof. CEO pay on Wall Street is back up to levels we last saw in 2006. Even Wells Fargo's CEO, yes, the recidivist megabank that has violated numerous laws and harmed millions of consumers, was paid \$17.5 million last year. In fact, the CEO was paid 291 times the median salary for Wells Fargo employees.

While Wall Street has fully recovered, Main Street has not. As Neel Kashkari, a Republican former Treasury official who now serves as the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis argued in a Washington Post op-ed on March 8, 2018: "The Great Recession pushed millions of Americans out of the labor force, some of whom still haven't returned. Although the headline unemployment rate has fallen from a peak of 10 percent during the recession to 4.1 percent this past January, that statistic ignores people who have given up looking for work. A different measure of people in their prime working years suggests that more than 1 million Americans are still on the sidelines."

Keep in mind, these are warnings from a Republican official. In fact, he goes on to say: "Big banks still threaten our economy."

So I will continue to oppose measures like H.R. 4061 that would return our regulatory regime back to a system that encouraged interconnected, huge firms to grow at all costs and that cheered as these firms devised new and so-called innovative products, many of which are only innovative in terms of how risky and unsound they were.

As so many have noted, if we undermine the ability of FSOC to stand guard, as this bill would do, then we risk opening the door once again to the wolves of Wall Street to wreak havoc with our economy again.

This bill, in effect, recreates the moral hazard in Wall Street's corporate culture that promotes profits before consumers. This bill would put the interests of corporate America before protections of consumers, the interests of the public, and the stability of the U.S. economy.

So, we must all remain vigilant against bills like this or we risk another financial crisis. I, therefore, urge

my colleagues to learn from the mistakes of the past and oppose H.R. 4061.

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely weary of coming to this floor with bills that deregulate megabanks. I am absolutely tired of coming to this floor having to remind my colleagues over and over again about the crisis that we had to be presented with and had to work through in 2008.

I don't know why it is our Members find so much time to protect the biggest banks in America, the richest banks in America, the CEOs who are making millions of dollars, while, in fact, the consumers come second or third in the work that they are doing.

This is simply about deregulation. This is about giving the banks more power. This is about disregarding the fact that we have had to fine them over and over again and they still find ways to defraud and to cheat the consumers of America.

As the chairman just mentioned about the fines of Wells Fargo, well, they are up for another fine of about a billion dollars because they cheated their clients, they cheated their customers, they created accounts in their names that they didn't know anything about, they forced insurance on them that they didn't need, many of them already had insurance, and it goes on and on and on.

I hope that we could convince our Members that we need to spend more time on some of the issues that are really confronting America.

I am on this committee as the ranking member. We don't have any bills or any sessions about homelessness. We are not talking about the people who are on the street all over America. We are not talking about the housing crisis where the average family even that is employed working every day can't afford to buy a home, now can't even afford to lease a place to live. It is off the scale.

I could go on and recount all of the things we should be addressing just in our committee, not to talk about the other things and issues in this Congress of the United States that we should be looking at, we should be paying attention to.

We have had all of the gun issues, we have all the issues that are going on now about Syria, and on and on and on, and yet we find the time to come to this floor day in and day out, time and time again, to talk about how we can make the biggest banks in America richer and more profitable.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds just to say as the jihad against banks continues, if you read the bill, it doesn't have to do with banks, it has to do with nonbanks. And the apocalyptic vision that is described by the ranking member is supported by a majority of Democrats on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS),

who serves as the vice chairman of our Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance and is the Republican sponsor of this piece of legislation.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, for his kind words, for his leadership, and more importantly, for his friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to also thank the staff of the Financial Services Committee in the work they have taken on behalf of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, as some of you may know, the Financial Services Committee has been operating at a breakneck speed in the 115th Congress. In fact, we have had Financial Services bills on the floor 17 of the last 18 weeks that the House has been in session.

I am proud to highlight that the majority of these bills have been passed out of this Chamber by strong bipartisan majorities.

Throughout this process, we have demonstrated that the House can find bipartisan agreement on commonsense measures that will benefit our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill that continues this streak of bipartisanship in the service of Americans back home, H.R. 4061, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act.

My good friend from Maryland, Congressman JOHN DELANEY, and I have been working this bill for nearly 5 years, with the shared goal of improving resiliency of our financial system, while protecting Americans from costly and unnecessary regulations that create barriers to achieving their financial goals.

By codifying procedures to increase the transparency of the nonbank systemically important financial institutions, or SIFIs, designation process, and providing a chance for nonbank firms to work with their primary regulators to reduce risks prior to designation, our legislation achieves this goal.

Mr. Speaker, we must be clear that simply designating more companies as systemically important financial institutions does not make our system safer. That is especially true for nonbank firms, like asset managers and insurers, that don't fit well into the bank-centered regulatory regime for SIFIs.

Handing down a SIFI designation to a nonbank financial firm is like using a sledgehammer to catch a butterfly. Not only are you unlikely to succeed, but you are also likely to destroy the very thing you set out to protect.

After all, it is the family saving for the downpayment on a home or retirement or the children's education that suffer when FSOC uses a heavy-handed regulation of last resort as the primary line of defense against threats to our economy.

The American Action Forum has found that additional capital requirements resulting from a SIFI designation of asset management firms could cost American retirees at least \$100,000

in potential savings over the lifetime of their investment. That is significant.

That is why these reforms included in H.R. 4061 are critical to the more than 90 million investors who rely on the services of asset managers to achieve their most important financial goals.

□ 1545

To be sure, FSOC has begun to recognize the benefits of providing increased transparency and, in 2015, FSOC made welcome reforms to improve the nonbank SIFI designation process. Many of these are codified in this bill.

Importantly, our legislation will also give FSOC the authority it needs to work with primary regulators who have institutional knowledge, skill, and experience overseeing nonbank firms to address threats to our economy without jeopardizing our constituents' financial opportunities.

After 8 years, if we don't take steps to address the obvious shortcomings of FSOC, like the nonbank designation process, the regulator intended to protect the financial stability could very well become the liability.

Again, I am proud to have worked with my colleague and friend, JOHN DELANEY, on this great bill, and I appreciate the support of Chairman HENSARLING in moving it through committee and now onto the House floor.

This bill does have 58 original cosponsors—29 Democrats, 29 Republicans. It passed out of the Financial Services Committee 45-10. Our legislation demonstrates that there can be broad bipartisan support for increased transparency of the FSOC SIFI designation.

I believe we can do even more, and I welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues on additional bipartisan reforms beyond those we are considering today to better address systemic risk by firming up the cooperative relationship between FSOC and the primary regulator to ensure substantive engagement that can result in swift resolution of FSOC's concerns prior to all SIFI designations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

I would like to just walk through some of what happens with FSOC with these nonbank designations and the process, because I have always wanted to be sure that the process would give these nonbanks an opportunity to basically convince FSOC that they were safe and they were sound and they didn't present any risk, and all of that.

Of course, a lot of this was triggered by AIG. If you remember AIG and what happened with this nonbank who was involved in credit default swaps without the collateral to back them up, this certainly was informative, and it helped to develop this process.

Stage 1, the metrics: minimum quantitative metrics for a nonbank finan-

cial company to be eligible for designation.

Stage 2, preliminary review, 6 months: staff analyzes preliminary data and meets with the company, consults with existing regulators.

Stage 3, in-depth review, 14 months: staff analyzes extensive data, meets with company, consults with existing regulators, FSOC deputies meet with company.

Proposed designation and hearing on the final designation, 4 months. FSOC provides written basis of proposed designation, oral hearings, provides lengthy written basis of final designation.

Total time from outset of analysis to final designation, 2 years.

Judicial and annual reviews: any designated company may challenge FSOC's determination in court; every designated company is re-reviewed by FSOC every year to consider de-designation.

I want you to know what is being proposed in this bill is quite different and, instead of the 2 years that I have just walked through, it would take approximately 4.3 years. At such time, you could have one of these nonbanks in trouble, presenting great risk, and you would not be able to do very much about it.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), who serves as the chairman of our Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I am going to miss both the chairman and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) after they leave this term.

I am going to try to address the ranking member's timing issue, but the fact is that much of this bill simply codifies what FSOC's current process is and, thus, is not changing that timing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4061, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act of 2017, which would enhance transparency and procedural fairness for the nonbank systemically important financial institutions designation process.

Dodd-Frank created FSOC and charged it with identifying risks to the financial stability of financial companies that would pose a threat to our overall financial stability. The problem with this is that FSOC has the authority to designate a nonbank financial institution, such as an asset manager or an insurance company, and subject the institution to heightened prudential supervision and regulation by the Federal Reserve.

All you hear from the other side is that this is about megabanks. It is the exact opposite. It is about these insurance companies and these asset managers and broker dealers.

In 2014, FSOC designated MetLife, a life insurance company, for "heightened prudential supervision" by the

Federal Reserve. However, in 2016, a Federal district court rescinded FSOC's SIFI designation of MetLife, finding that it was "arbitrary and capricious" and that the FSOC had "made critical departures" from its own standards from making designation determinations.

Now, I wasn't there when Dodd-Frank was created, but I have been dealing with the echo effect of it for the last 7 years, and I don't believe this is what Congress intended. I don't believe that the architects—in fact, I can't believe that the architects—of Dodd-Frank intended for bank regulators to rewrite the rules of insurance companies.

As *The Wall Street Journal* wrote: "It's as if a committee of baseball umpires rewrote the rules of football despite protests from the NFL players, owners, and referees."

Let me give a personal example. My political science degree should then qualify me to be a chemical lab scientist. Hey, they both have science in the title.

It doesn't make sense.

In fact, even Barney Frank, the law's namesake, told Congress that, in general, he did not believe that companies "that just sell insurance" should be designated as systemic.

Well, today we have the ability to right the ship. By passing this important bill, Congress has the opportunity to bring about commonsense, bipartisan reforms to this designation process. And this is what American, hard-working taxpayers expect out of us: an ability to find a solution.

Specifically, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act of 2017 would amend the Dodd-Frank Act to require FSOC to determine whether to subject a U.S. or a foreign nonbank financial company to supervision by the Federal Reserve, must consider the appropriateness of imposing heightened prudential standards as opposed to other forms of regulation to mitigate identified risks to the financial stability. In other words, as my friend from Florida said, don't go butterfly hunting with a sledgehammer.

H.R. 4061 directs FSOC to reevaluate, both annually and periodically, final determinations of systemic risk regarding a nonbank financial company under supervision.

Finally, the bill directs the FSOC to study the impacts of its determinations to nonbank financial companies to Fed supervision and prudential standards and whether such determinations have the intended result of improving domestic financial stability every 5 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HUIZENGA. I would like to commend the bipartisan work of my colleagues and friends, Representative ROSS and Representative DELANEY.

They have done a great job on this. Their bipartisan approach enhances the ability of FSOC to mitigate risk, a very important element, but it also ensures that affected nonbank—again, nonbank—financial institutions are afforded the opportunity and the ability to question and engage—not veto, but to question and engage—the FSOC prior to a final SIFI designation being made.

This is good work that gives hard-working taxpayers a solution, and this is what they expect: commonsense, bipartisan solutions. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with Members a statement from the former Secretary of the Treasury who had the responsibility to head FSOC, and that is Jacob J. Lew. He said, and I will read from his communication to us:

Unfortunately, none of the legislation the committee plans to consider this week—referring to this bill—would strengthen the Council's ability to address the very real risk the largest and most complex financial firms could pose.

Instead, these proposals would be a big step backwards for regulatory tools to prevent the same kinds of threats. These bills would severely undermine and impair the Council. One of the proposals would require the Council to spend 4 years analyzing a firm before taking action to address any risk the firms may propose, doubling the time period for designation review.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2-1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), the lead Democratic cosponsor of the legislation and a hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for giving me an opportunity to rise in support of H.R. 4061, a bipartisan bill that I worked very closely on with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS), and I thank him for giving me the opportunity to partner with him on this bill. This is a bill, as has already been stated, that came out of the Financial Services Committee with the support of the majority of the Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, about 10 years ago, we had a financial crisis; and during that financial crisis, 19 of the 20 largest financial institutions in this country failed or needed support from the Federal Government. More importantly, tens of millions of Americans lost their jobs, lost their homes, lost their retirement savings.

In the wake of that crisis, it was very appropriate for Congress to do something, and we did, with Dodd-Frank legislation, which is legislation that I strongly support. As part of the Dodd-Frank legislation, FSOC was established, the Financial Stability Oversight Council; and the job of FSOC was to reduce systemic risk in the financial

services sector, which is a mission that I also support.

But they were given very limited tools to fulfill that mission. Effectively, their one tool was to designate companies as systemically risky to the system. So they had the power to designate; they didn't really have the power to de-risk the system, which should be their job.

What this piece of legislation—again, this piece of strongly bipartisan legislation—does is effectively empower FSOC with the ability to reduce risk in the financial services system by working in a collaborative manner with companies that it is considering designated and the primary regulators of those companies to develop plans to de-risk those companies.

Mr. Speaker, wouldn't we be better off with a financial services system that has less risk in it, fewer companies that are considered systemically risky in substance, as opposed to having a system that is inherently more risky or has greater risk and has more companies designated?

In other words, designation doesn't, in and of itself, reduce risk. What reduces risk is primary regulators working with FSOC and companies that it deems potentially worthy of designation to develop strategies and plans to de-risk those companies. That is precisely what this legislation does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DELANEY. That is precisely what this designation does, which is why so many Democrats supported this bill, because we believe, as do many of my Republican colleagues, that the mission of FSOC is worthy and that we should be empowering FSOC to do its job and de-risk the financial industry of the United States of America.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do think that it is important that we share as much information as we can about FSOC because not a lot is known by the average person about FSOC, and when we talk about it, we oftentimes fail to talk about who makes up FSOC.

We are talking about 10 voting members, headed by Treasury, the Treasury Secretary. You have on FSOC all of the experts. You have the Federal Reserve. You have the FDIC. You have the OCC. You have the NCUA. You have the CFPB, the FHFA, the SEC, the CFTC, and an independent insurance expert. So here you have convened on the FSOC all of these experts, and they are looking at nonbanks that could present great risk to our economy, like AIG.

I have to keep reminding people about AIG because AIG was this nonbank that we bailed out to the tune of about \$182 billion, \$183 billion.

□ 1600

Don't forget, they were involved with credit default swaps that were not

collateralized. They were basically putting insurance out there that, when the time came due for them to have to pay off, they couldn't because they didn't have the collateral to do that.

So with these experts, with the experiences that we have gone through, FSOC makes a lot of sense. And when it is said that all they can do is designate, that is extremely important because that gives the companies an opportunity to go back and take a look at themselves and see what they can do to reduce this risk to become more stable, and this has happened already.

As a matter of fact, I think to designate a nonbank, FSOC must have a vote of two-thirds of its members, including the Treasury Secretary. So this is not easily done.

Again, designation gives the companies an opportunity to go back and take a look. At least one of them has decided to downsize.

Let me just share this with you. First, FSOC is certainly not running a Hotel California. A designated firm like GE Capital was able to make the kind of risk-reducing structural reforms that led to their de-designation under the annual review process required by Dodd-Frank. So, no, designated firms are not stuck with their designation forever.

Don't forget, they get reviewed every year. Don't forget, they can make changes. Don't forget, they can take the advice. They can come in and they can continue to work on putting themselves in order so that they can get de-designated. And I think that is extremely important and that should not get lost.

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 serves as the vice chairman of our Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment Subcommittee.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his work on this and some of the other things. When you look at the number of bipartisan bills that have passed out of the Financial Services Committee this session, it is really impressive, and I am grateful for his work.

I also want to thank DENNIS ROSS and JOHN DELANEY and all my colleagues who have worked so diligently on H.R. 4061, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act of 2017, which I strongly support.

I think it is fair to say that a Financial Stability Oversight Council chaired by Secretary Mnuchin is not extremely likely to subject nonbanks to enhanced prudential supervision.

In fact, I understand they are considering removing some designations.

However, Congress still should take the appropriate steps to make the law that provides this authority to the Treasury much more practical.

Furthermore, I would like to point out that although I was happy to see

many great provisions of the regulatory relief package put together by Chairman CRAPO over in the Senate, including a number of bills I have offered with my colleagues in the House, I was extremely disappointed with the fact that the legislation didn't include this legislation or something similar to it.

I don't understand how Congress can justify a regulatory reform package that does so little to ease Dodd-Frank's cost on investors, especially when the Financial Services Committee in the House has taken demonstrated steps, a strong record of bipartisan success, in making reforms to FSOC's nonbank SIFI designation authority.

The Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act amends the Dodd-Frank Act to require the FSOC, when determining whether to subject a U.S. or foreign nonbank financial company to supervision by the Fed, to consider the appropriateness of imposing heightened prudential standards.

In other words, it provides these nonbanks the opportunities to adjust their business models before being subjected to supervision by the Federal Reserve, thereby acknowledging that these companies might wish to change their business model after such a designation in order to be free of these substantial regulatory costs.

It is important that we have well-defined processes in place so these nonbanks understand the rules of the road. The government provides these companies some reasonable due process when proposing to dramatically interrupt their business with a slew of new regulatory requirements.

Finally, let's remember that investors bear the costs of inappropriate regulation being applied to nonbanks, like mutual funds.

The asset management industry is modeled in a fundamentally different way, and our regulatory system should reflect that. Investors take on the risk and manage those risks in order to receive returns to pay for things like retirement or education for their children. Safety and soundness regulation, as the Fed applies it to the banks, is completely inappropriate.

At a minimum, we should be providing nonbanks like mutual funds a chance to work with the FSOC to address their concerns before slapping investors with new regulatory costs.

Finally, we should never forget, again, that this was a strong bipartisan bill that received 45 votes in committee, and we ought to all consider supporting it here on the floor. I am going to, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

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 Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), who serves as the vice chairman of our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROSS) for introducing this important measure being considered today.

Mr. Speaker, the Dodd-Frank Act introduced into our Nation's capital a new culture of regulatory burden where a select few Washington bureaucrats dictate how our Nation's financial institutions should run themselves. While I support the necessary regulations from our Nation's fiduciary rule makers that upholds the goals of safety, soundness, and fair play, far too often our regulators have overstepped their boundaries and entered into dangerous territory of overregulation.

Section 113 of the Dodd-Frank Act gave the Financial Stability Oversight Council immense deliberate power to declare nonbank financial companies as systemically important to the financial stability of the United States.

Once that determination is made, these nonbank financial institutions become subject to extraordinarily stringent prudential supervision and regulation by the Federal Reserve. This is a power that should not be taken lightly.

FSOC's systemically important designation carries with it a significant regulatory burden, a new public perception, and a new regulator.

Mr. ROSS' legislation would require the FSOC, when deliberating on whether or not to designate a nonbank as systemically important, to consider the appropriateness of imposing new burdens on the institution, as opposed to pursuing other forms of regulation to mitigate identified risk to the financial stability of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. ROSS' legislation would help end the culture of overregulation in Washington and alleviate the intense burden that has been imposed on many institutions that have unsparingly received this designation.

This is not to say that FSOC's power to designate institutions as systemically important should not be used, but rather that FSOC should exercise its authority judiciously and in its intended manner.

Mr. ROSS' bill ensures that the FSOC's designations going forward will be prudent, shrewd, and most important, necessary.

The good news out of Washington is that the culture of overregulation is changing. A new era has been ushered in that thinks twice before regulating, thoughtfully revisits the necessity and effectiveness in past regulations, and considers the burden of future regulations.

Much of this has to do with the changes in leadership at the regulatory agencies and the good work being pursued there. But changes in who creates and enforces the regulations aren't enough.

In order for our small towns to be able to prosper, our small businesses to grow, and our families to succeed, we must continue to pursue legislative changes to regulations that sustain

this new era of regulatory cautiousness and predictability.

By pursuing legislative fixes to regulatory problems, we can provide the certainty required by our financial sector, both big and small, to once again provide a bright future for the American economy and for American families.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ross' legislation being considered on the floor helps to cement that certainty, and I encourage my colleagues to support the measure here today.

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

Mr. Speaker, a moment ago, I identified the 10 voting members that serve on FSOC. I did not add to that the nonvoting members. To show you the expertise that is involved with FSOC, they also have these nonvoting members: Estate Insurance Regulator, Estate Bank Regulator, State Securities Regulator, and the Federal Insurance Office.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), one of the Democrat cosponsors of the legislation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support the committee system. The Democratic Caucus has put roughly 25 of its members on the Financial Services Committee. We are the members of the Democratic Caucus assigned to study and debate legislation on Financial Services issues.

We did just that. And 60 percent of the Democrats assigned to the Financial Services Committee, 15 Democrats, voted in favor of this bill, while 10 opposed it.

So if members of our caucus wonder what would our caucus position be if all the members of our caucus had a chance to really analyze bills in this particular technical area, one would expect that 60 percent of our caucus would support this legislation.

The reason for that is that the purpose of regulation is to reduce risk rather than having risk be the reason to have regulation.

This bill focuses on getting companies to reduce their risk. There are those that say if we just designate more companies as SIFIs, we will get more regulation.

No, you won't.

What you get is more companies designated, but then you get pressure to have less regulation on all the designated companies.

What we need is to reserve the SIFI designation for those who are clearly exposing our economy to the risk of another meltdown, and we need to encourage companies to be less of a risk to our economy.

The ranking member, who is bearing a substantial oratorical challenge, being, I think, the only speaker opposing the bill, correctly points out that AIG was a risk to our economy.

That is right.

This bill would have put it to AIG that you are going to get designated and regulated if you don't get out of the credit default business.

Had they done that, the meltdown in 2008 would have been much less significant.

So let us encourage these companies to de-risk, and let us have heightened regulation on those who refuse to do so or who by their very size pose a risk to our entire economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Democratic Caucus to have some faith in the 60 percent majority who have been assigned to the Financial Services Committee and voted in favor of this bill.

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

One of the wonderful things about working and living in a democracy is that people have an opportunity to have opinions and to voice them and to act out on them. And certainly we don't always agree on everything. The Republicans don't always agree in their caucuses. Sometimes they walk lockstep for all kinds of reasons, but they do disagree sometimes when they feel it is safe to do so.

But Democrats do not always agree, and we disagree perhaps more in our caucus than Republicans do, and we feel free to do that because we understand the importance of the democracy and what it permits and allows you to do.

So in saying that, we take every effort in my committee to make sure that all of our members have the information that they need. My staff is available to provide any assistance that we can provide. So we are very pleased and proud that I, as the ranking member, operate the committee in a way that respects all of its members.

And even those members who come to the floor who are opposed, perhaps, to a bill or are supporting a bill that I and others may oppose, I respect that. That is how democracy works.

So today, we do have Democratic members who are supporting this bill. For whatever reasons, they believe that FSOC perhaps is too tough on some of the companies, that somehow they really don't achieve their mission of reducing risk. Whatever it is they believe, they certainly have a right to do that. And I respect that.

□ 1615

Having said that, I believe that the lesson that we learn, as a result of 2008 and the recession that we went through, and AIG, the nonbank, in particular, that we bailed out when we saw the weakness of AIG, and the fact that they had basically dealt with these credit default swaps, and that it had created such a problem in our economy, I am so pleased that we had the foresight and the wisdom to come up with a way by which to identify this risk of the nonbanks so that they do

not create the kind of turbulence and problems that we had in 2008.

Having said that, I am very pleased about the wide breadth of expertise that is on the FSOC. And I certainly believe that having gone through the steps that they take, that those steps will allow everyone to understand and see how fair they are, what kind of time it takes; and it gives every opportunity to be de-designated from being identified as a SIFI.

So I am very pleased and proud that I am able to say to my colleagues—no matter how they vote—that I believe that the FSOC is an important reform in the Dodd-Frank reforms. I would ask them to oppose this bill, but if they do not support it, I respect that. I think we should all remember that each and every one of us—elected by the people who send us here—have a voice and we have a right to represent our constituents in the best way that we see possible.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds just to say I take note that the ranking member respects her Democrat Members who disagree with her, but, apparently, not enough to yield them any of her time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), yet another hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROSS) for leading the fight on this issue, and also for the support across the aisle on this issue.

Mr. Ross' bill corrects another oversight of the Dodd-Frank Act by reforming the nonbank SIFI designation process.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not take away FSOC's ability to designate nonbank financial institutions with the SIFI tag. It simply gives these institutions a greater opportunity to be heard before their final designation from FSOC.

FSOC should not be able to simply dish out this designation to these institutions, subjecting them to Federal Reserve requirements, without explaining their reasoning. Unfortunately, we have seen FSOC do this in the past. This is especially important since nonbank financial institutions are clearly different entities than banks are. Capital requirements, for example, might not be suitable to address the risk profile of nonbank financial institutions, so why even subject them to these requirements.

This is not a smart regulation, Mr. Speaker. Simply put, the nonbank SIFI designation process is not fair in its current form. Again, this bill is a smart, targeted step that I am confident will benefit investors and benefit our economy. Transparency and fairness should be welcome and not rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill.

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

In these debates, oftentimes we find ourselves explaining to people how our committees work, and that is very good that we take the opportunity to do that because I think that, in this complicated system that we work in, people need to understand what we do and how we do it.

I am very appreciative to the chairman for recognizing and giving time to some of our Members today, and I think he will remember that I have done that for him also. I can recall on flood insurance, the National Flood Insurance bill, I was very gracious and I gave Members on the Republican side of the aisle an opportunity to have a say. And not only that, Ex-Im Bank was another instance where I gave time to the Members from the opposite side of the aisle, so I would not like people who are listening to think that somehow this is unusual.

We do use the influence and power of our positions to determine when that makes good sense for us, and I would like to say to the chairman of our committee: There will be other times when I will afford Republicans an opportunity to speak and have their say when you don't feel that that is the proper thing for you to do at that time. So let us all remember how this system works.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the right to close. I have no further speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, week after week, the majority is continuing to push through bills to roll back critical reforms that Democrats put in place to protect consumers, investors, and our economy. Let's recount some of the bills that the majority has recently pushed through the House:

In recent months, they have passed legislation to allow payday lenders to evade State interest rate caps, decrease operational risk capital requirements, and roll back enhanced prudential standards for the Nation's largest banks; weaken customer protections for mortgages; undermine efforts to combat discriminatory and predatory lending; reduce consumer privacy protections; weaken rules that the financial services industry finds inconvenient; undermine protections for mom-and-pop investors; and allow financial institutions to challenge rules, financial regulations, in court, if they believe them not to be uniquely tailored to their business needs.

Every week, the list of harmful legislation put forth by the majority for House passage grows. H.R. 4061, the so-called Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act is the latest example of the majority's misguided and reckless agenda.

H.R. 4061 helps financial institutions to delay or block heightened oversight and weakens FSOC's ability to protect our economy. Mr. Speaker, this bill ignores the lessons of the past and invites the return to the risky financial system that led to the financial crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Members to oppose the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3 1/4 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, why is this important, and what does this bill do? Let me try to make it very succinct. Dodd-Frank gave the Federal Government the power to designate firms to be too big to fail and backed them up with a taxpayer fund, a bailout fund. We think that is wrong.

But that is not what this bill does. The bill doesn't repeal the bailout fund. It simply says to nonbanks—not banks, nonbanks—mutual funds, insurance companies: You know what? Before we knock you upside the head with a sledgehammer, we are going to give you a chance to get your act together.

That is essentially what this bill does. And why is that important? It is important because we have people who are trying to capitalize small businesses. It is important because we have people who are trying to save for their retirement. Enhanced prudential standards, which is the legal term of art for coming down with a ton of bricks onto a company, that can cost people.

In fact, it has been estimated that these enhanced prudential capital requirements imposed with a SIFI designation, a too-big-to-fail designation on a mutual fund, could trim as much as 25 percent or \$108,000 for a mutual fund investor's returns over a lifetime of investing. That comes out of the pockets of our seniors. That is why this is so important.

Contrary to what you hear on the other side of the aisle, the FSOC, the Financial Stability Oversight Council, will still have full ability to designate an institution as too big to fail. But it says: You know what? Before you do that, consider some other methods: consider seniors, consider small businesses, and consider the impact of what you are going to do.

Look at what happened to GE Capital. This was one of the great financing companies in America, and they were basically a coyote in a trap that had to chew its leg off. There is hardly anything left of them. They used to fund furniture retailers, bread bakeries, Jack in the Box franchises. They provided credit to startups all over America, \$31 billion in 2010 to 1.2 million small and midsized businesses, and now, next to nothing. Next to nothing,

because they were designated as a nonbank SIFI.

The ranking member brings up AIG, but guess what? AIG was regulated by a Federal regulator who had full ability to stop anything they were doing for safety and soundness. And guess what? The regulator, in which many on the other side of the aisle put total faith into, they missed it. They screwed up. They said under oath in our committee: Yeah, we had full authority to stop it, and we just missed it. We just missed it.

So it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we improve this Financial Stability Oversight Council. I urge all Members to support H.R. 4061.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4061. Among other important provisions, a key component of this bill is the creation of a new subsection K within Sec. 113 of the Dodd Frank Act. This section calls on FSOC to consider "the imposition of prudential standards as opposed to other forms of regulation to mitigate the identified risks." I am confident that members of both parties in the House and the Senate share the common goal of avoiding future financial crises—our debates since the enactment of Dodd Frank have been around how best to achieve this overarching goal. That's why I believe that if we were considering language today calling on all financial regulators, both state and Federal, to meet on an ongoing basis, to compare notes and make recommendations on steps that each agency could take to achieve this goal, it would pass by unanimous consent.

Asset managers, insurers, and other financial intermediaries serve a critical role in helping our constituents manage the financial risks they will face throughout their lives and meet their financial needs and objectives. Managing assets, whether personal or as part of a retirement plan such as a 401(k), has increasingly become the responsibility of individuals who are well served by asset managers and the products they provide. And managing longevity and mortality risks are just two areas of expertise that insurers are uniquely situated to help. I think we would agree these essential products and services should be well regulated, but in an efficient manner that allows providers the room to innovate and serve their customers' needs.

New subsection K of this bill is a charge for regulators to act, on an ongoing basis, to take the steps necessary to help companies operate in a safe and sound manner as the first line of defense against future economic stress. In other words, this bill encourages regulators to determine what activities are potentially risky, using, among other tools, the process set forth in section 120 of the Dodd Frank Act, and calls on the appropriate prudential regulator to ensure they appropriately address such activities on an ongoing basis. This approach makes eminent sense, can help prevent a future crisis, and I am pleased to support this provision and the entire legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 780, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 4061 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 4293; and

Passage of H.R. 4293, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 297, nays 121, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—297

Abraham	Curbelo (FL)	Issa
Aderholt	Curtis	Jenkins (KS)
Aguilar	Davidson	Jenkins (WV)
Allen	Davis (CA)	Johnson (LA)
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	Delaney	Johnson, Sam
Arrington	DelBene	Jordan
Babin	Denham	Joyce (OH)
Bacon	Dent	Katko
Banks (IN)	DeSantis	Keating
Barletta	DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)
Barton	Donovan	Kennedy
Beatty	Duffy	Kihuen
Bera	Duncan (SC)	Kilmer
Bergman	Duncan (TN)	Kind
Beyer	Dunn	King (IA)
Biggs	Emmer	King (NY)
Billirakis	Estes (KS)	Kinzinger
Bishop (MI)	Esty (CT)	Knight
Bishop (UT)	Faso	Kuster (NH)
Black	Ferguson	Kustoff (TN)
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Labadar
Blum	Fleischmann	LaHood
Blunt Rochester	Flores	LaMalfa
Bost	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	Lance
F.	Fox	Larsen (WA)
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Brat	Gaetz	Lawson (FL)
Bridenstine	Gallagher	Lewis (MN)
Brooks (AL)	Garrett	Lipinski
Brooks (IN)	Gianforte	LoBiondo
Brown (MD)	Gibbs	Loebach
Brownley (CA)	Gohmert	Long
Buchanan	Gonzalez (TX)	Loudermilk
Buck	Goodlatte	Love
Bucshon	Gosar	Lucas
Budd	Gottheimer	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Gowdy	Lujan Grisham,
Bustos	Granger	M.
Byrne	Graves (GA)	MacArthur
Calvert	Graves (LA)	Maloney, Sean
Carbajal	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Cárdenas	Griffith	Marino
Carter (GA)	Grothman	Marshall
Carter (TX)	Guthrie	Massie
Chabot	Hanabusa	Mast
Cheney	Handel	McCarthy
Clark (MA)	Harper	McCaul
Coffman	Harris	McClintock
Cole	Hartzler	McEachin
Collins (GA)	Heck	McHenry
Collins (NY)	Hensarling	McKinley
Comer	Herrera Beutler	McMorris
Comstock	Hice, Jody B.	Rodgers
Conaway	Higgins (LA)	McSally
Cook	Hill	Meadows
Cooper	Himes	Meehan
Correa	Holding	Meeks
Costa	Hollingsworth	Meng
Costello (PA)	Hudson	Messer
Crawford	Huizenga	Mitchell
Crist	Hultgren	Moolenaar
Cuellar	Hunter	Mooney (WV)
Culberson	Hurd	Moulton

Mullin	Rohrabacher	Suoizzi
Murphy (FL)	Rokita	Taylor
Neal	Rooney, Francis	Tenney
Newhouse	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Noem	Roskam	Thompson (PA)
Norcross	Ross	Thornberry
Norman	Rothfus	Tipton
Nunes	Rouzer	Trott
O'Halleran	Royce (CA)	Turner
Olson	Ruiz	Upton
Palazzo	Ruppersberger	Valadao
Palmer	Russell	Vargas
Paulsen	Rutherford	Veasey
Payne	Sanford	Vela
Pearce	Schneider	Wagner
Perlmutter	Schrader	Walberg
Perry	Schweikert	Walden
Peters	Scott, Austin	Walker
Peterson	Scott, David	Walorski
Pittenger	Sensenbrenner	Walters, Mimi
Poe (TX)	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Poliquin	Sewell (AL)	Webster (FL)
Posey	Sherman	Wenstrup
Quigley	Shimkus	Westerman
Ratcliffe	Shuster	Williams
Reed	Sinema	Wilson (SC)
Reichert	Smith (MO)	Wittman
Renacci	Smith (NE)	Womack
Rice (NY)	Smith (NJ)	Woodall
Rice (SC)	Smith (TX)	Yoder
Roby	Smucker	Yoho
Roe (TN)	Stefanik	Young (AK)
Rogers (AL)	Stewart	Young (IA)
Rogers (KY)	Stivers	Zeldin

NAYS—121

Adams	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Barragán	Gomez	Pallone
Bass	Green, Al	Panetta
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Bonamici	Grijalva	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Pingree
Butterfield	Hastings	Pocan
Capuano	Higgins (NY)	Polis
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Huffman	Raskin
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Rosen
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Jones	Sánchez
Cleaver	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Cohen	Khanna	Schiff
Connolly	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Krishnamoorthi	Serrano
Crowley	Langevin	Sires
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Soto
DeFazio	Lee	Speier
DeGette	Levin	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Takano
Demings	Lieu, Ted	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Titus
Deutch	Lowenthal	Tonko
Dingell	Lowe	Torres
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Velazquez
F.	Maloney,	Visclosky
Ellison	Carolyn B.	Wasserman
Engel	Matsui	Schultz
Eshoo	McCollum	Waters, Maxine
Españlat	McGovern	Watson Coleman
Evans	McNerney	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Napolitano	
Gallego	Nolan	

NOT VOTING—10

Bishop (GA)	Rooney, Thomas	Simpson
Cramer	J.	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Scalise	Wilson (FL)
Moore	Shea-Porter	

□ 1653

Mses. BARRAGÁN, JACKSON LEE, and Mr. NADLER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Messrs. MEEKS, HECK, and Mrs. BEATTY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 135.

STRESS TEST IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 4293) to reform the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review process, the Dodd-Frank Act Stress Test process, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 231, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—188

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

Swalwell (CA) Tsongas
Takano Vargas
Thompson (CA) Veasey
Thompson (MS) Vela
Titus Velázquez
Tonko Visclosky
Torres

NAYS—231

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

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (GA) Rooney, Thomas
Frankel (FL) J.
Lowenthal Scalise
Moore Shea-Porter

□ 1701

Mr. VISCLOSKY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Culler
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 174, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

YEAS—245

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

Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—174

Adams Gomez
Aguilar Gonzalez (TX)
Barragán Green, Al
Bass Green, Gene
Bera Grijalva
Beyer Gutiérrez
Blumenauer Hanabusa
Blunt Rochester Hastings
Bonamici Heck
Boyle, Brendan Higgins (NY)
F. Himes
Brady (PA) Hoyer
Brown (MD) Huffman
Brownley (CA) Jackson Lee
Bustos Jayapal
Butterfield Jeffries
Capuano Johnson (GA)
Carbajal Johnson, E. B.
Cárdenas Jones
Carson (IN) Kaptur
Cartwright Keating
Castor (FL) Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX) Kennedy
Chu, Judy Khanna
Cicilline Kihuen
Clark (MA) Kildeer
Clarke (NY) Kilmer
Clay Kind
Clyburn Krishnamoorthi
Connolly Kuster (NH)
Cooper Langevin
Courtney Larsen (WA)
Crist Larson (CT)
Crowley Lawrence
Cummings Lawson (FL)
Davis (CA) Lee
Davis, Danny Levin
DeFazio Lewis (GA)
DeGette Lieu, Ted
Delaney Lipinski
DeLauro Loebach
DelBene Lofgren
Demings Lowenthal
DeSaulnier Lowey
Deutch Lujan Grisham,
Dingell M.
Doggett Luján, Ben Ray
Doyle, Michael Lynch
F. Maloney,
Ellison Carolyn B.
Engel Maloney, Sean
Eshoo Matsui
Españat McCollum
Esty (CT) McEachin
Evans McGovern
Foster McNeerney
Fudge Meeks
Gabbard Meng
Gallego Moulton
Garamendi Nadler

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (GA) Rooney, Thomas
Frankel (FL) J.
Moore Scalise
Nolan Shea-Porter

□ 1709

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 135, “nay” on rollcall No. 136, and “yea” on rollcall No. 137.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING, A SCOURGE ON HUMANITY

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, at 15 years old, Jane was pregnant, alone, out on the streets, and ready to end her life. When Marcus and Robin Thompson found her, Jane thought she was saved. But instead of taking her to safety, the criminals forced the girl on a terrifying 6-week trek across the United States.

The outlaws photographed Jane in suggestive photos and sold her on the marketplace of sex slavery—human trafficking. Truck stops and sleazy hotel rooms became her life, sold to any pervert with the money and desire to buy sex from a child.

After multiple beatings, Jane sought help at a hospital, where nurses identified her as a sex-trafficked victim. The Thompsons are now locked up in prison for the crime they committed—modern day slavery.

Madam Speaker, human trafficking is a scourge. We must remain vigilant like the nurses in this case and rescue victims and send traffickers to the jailhouse where they belong. No more selling our children on the marketplace of slavery.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1715

CONGRATULATING COACH LANCE WIGFALL

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to honor Coach Lance Wigfall of East Orange, New Jersey, for becoming the 2017–2018 boys indoor track and field coach of the year.

Coach Wigfall was a star track athlete at East Orange during the late 1990s and early 2000s. Now, as coach, he is helping a new generation of young men grow as athletes and leaders.

During Coach Wigfall's tenure at East Orange, the school's track and field team has broken onto the national stage. But Coach Wigfall reminds his athletes to enjoy the moment, trust the process, and always put academics before athletics.

Coach Wigfall is a mentor and a role model for his team. He is an asset to East Orange and to all young people in New Jersey's 10th Congressional District.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Coach Wigfall for becoming coach of the year.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION GOOD CITIZENS AWARD

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

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize six high school sen-

iors who were selected as finalists for the Oneida County Good Citizens Award, presented by the Oneida County Chapter of the DAR, the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The 2018 finalists were Rachael Powles, Elizabeth Militillo, Crystal Lin, Madden Barnes, Abigail Hall, and William Thomas. Rachael Powles from Sauquoit Valley Central School was the first prize winner and will go on to represent Oneida County at the State level.

These six outstanding individuals were chosen based on their academic achievements, extracurricular activities, and an essay contest. These students clearly have a great future ahead of them, and it is great to see such strong youth leadership coming from Oneida County.

I wish the first prize winner, Rachael Powles, the best of luck as she continues in the New York State competition, and, hopefully, we will be seeing her in Washington, D.C., as a national finalist.

Madam Speaker, I ask that Members join me in congratulating these students on displaying qualities of service, leadership, and patriotism. The Daughters of the American Revolution is a highly respected organization that is devoted to our community, our children, and our Nation. Being a finalist in this wonderful organization is an honor, indeed.

FAIR HOUSING MONTH

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Fair Housing Act.

Signed into law 7 days after Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s tragic assassination in Memphis, Tennessee, the Fair Housing Act builds on his dream to ensure that every American can live wherever they choose.

While in the five decades, our country has made progress in securing equal opportunity and access to affordable housing for all with the unencumbered ability to rent or to buy, but our work continues.

In fact, just last week, in my community, community leaders broke ground on the final phase of a \$120 million public-private project for Legacy Pointe at Poindexter, fueled by a \$30 million HUD Choice Neighborhood grant that I helped to secure in 2014, but our work continues.

I stand here today in that spirit to say that I will continue to defend the central tenets of the Fair Housing Act so that all Americans can pursue the American Dream without fear of discrimination or redlining.

Madam Speaker, our work continues.

CONGRATULATING PLEASANT VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, tonight I rise to congratulate Pleasant Valley High School for sending both the boys and girls basketball teams to the State of California championship games for their division.

After incredibly successful seasons by both the girls and boys teams, I am very proud to say that both programs made it all the way to the finals played at the Golden 1 Center in Sacramento, home of the Sacramento Kings NBA team.

Though the two games had differing results, to be playing in the final game of the season in the State in your division while the rest of your opponents are home at spring break is plenty to be proud of. It says a lot about the students and the head coaches and their families on both teams.

The last time the Pleasant Valley girls made it to the State championship was 1985. This is the first trip for the boys to the State championship.

What these young men and women both did on the basketball courts this year was remarkable—even inspiring Pleasant Valley alum and Green Bay Packers quarterback Aaron Rodgers to contribute to their trip.

While the girls did lose a hard-fought contest, the boys pulled it out and won a 70–65 thriller in which they never trailed in the game.

Congratulations to the boys team on their first-ever State championship and to the girls team for again making another trip to the State finals. Indeed, a truly remarkable, outstanding season for Pleasant Valley High School for the boys and girls team. They have much to be proud of.

ATTACK ON SYRIA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, outrage is certainly not a tough enough word to watch the children of Syria, and innocent civilians, be attacked by poisonous gas. Assad is a vicious dictator, and Russia has propped him up.

It is important for the American people and for Syrian Americans to know that we will not tolerate the kind of vile violence, particularly against children. But Congress must stand for its constitutional responsibility of debating an authorization to use military force. We must not, at any time, recklessly ignore actions by the administration that really should be a collaborative thought-provoking discussion and debate on the strategy for dealing with the crisis in Syria, but, more importantly, the propping up of Assad by Russia and its supporters.

The children need us in Syria to be able to stop both the bloodshed and the terrible tragedy of gas attacks that immediately cause life and injury. It is time for us—the Members of Congress—

to come to this floor and debate our strategy in Syria.

TRIBUTE TO MARY REGULA

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, at this spring season of new life, please let us pay tribute to the spirited life of a visionary woman dedicated to high learning and civic improvement, Mary Regula from Ohio, who tragically passed this last week.

As an educator first, her love of history drew her to national causes. Mary had a style and a spirit all her own. I vividly recall her dressing as Mary Todd Lincoln at the dedication of the First Ladies Museum in Canton, Ohio, which she had spearheaded, as she dutifully and lovingly put in place fascinating historical truth about a long-neglected dimension of American political life.

A soulmate to her beloved husband, the very honorable Ohio Congressman Ralph Regula, Mary was a beautiful and engaging force for good and for progress on many levels.

On countless late nights here in the Capitol, she would work into the evening with her husband. Then, when votes were complete, they would drive home together, usually in Ralph's red pickup truck. Their service was a patriotic love of America.

May Mary Regula's family and friends, and the people of greater Canton, Ohio, which Mary and her husband served for 36 years, know our abiding gratitude for their service and for electing such an extraordinary Congressman, a seasoned appropriator, and his awesome life partner, beloved Mary.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RHONDA LEROCQUE

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

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

Rhonda was married to her husband, Jason, for 21 years, with whom she had a 6-year-old daughter, Ali.

Rhonda and Jason were very active in their church and enjoyed participating in humanitarian projects together. One of their biggest projects was when they traveled to New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina to help rebuild homes.

Rhonda worked for a design firm in Cambridge, Massachusetts, but dreamed of opening up her own catering business. She loved skiing, cooking, and baking, but nothing could surpass her love for her family. She is remembered for being a selfless and joyful woman who had a strong faith.

I would like to extend my condolences to Rhonda LeRocque's family

and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

INEQUALITY AND FAIRNESS FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, my colleagues and I wanted to spend a few moments on what, to me, is the most important domestic issue in our country right now: the issue of inequality and fairness for all Americans. It is at historic levels of disparity from where it should be, historically both from an economic standpoint, an ethical standpoint, and, in my view, a moral standpoint. It is important for Congress to know what the experts know and to share that with this House and with the American public.

I am pleased to partner with some of my good friends: Representative LEE, who I hope will be here soon, a good neighbor in northern California, who has done such extraordinary work around poverty and inequality; and also Ms. DELAURO from Connecticut, who has also helped us to put this Special Order together.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), my good friend and colleague, and a national spokesperson on issues of inequality.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I appreciate all of the work Congressman DESAULNIER does in this area. And I want to thank him for raising this particular issue for this Special Order.

Madam Speaker, I agree with him that inequality is the issue of the moment. Not only does inequality funnel money from working Americans up to the richest people, but what do they do with the money once it is up there? There is only a certain number of boats you can ski behind, only a certain number of houses you can buy, and only a certain number of luxury cars you can buy.

What do the billions go to? Much of it goes to things like merger and acquisition, and also political influence. It is very important to understand that as economic inequality has grown, political inequality has also grown. Nowadays, the money goes into some super-

PAC: some big, giant thing where they do independent expenditures and pour money in against their enemies and pour money in in favor of their friends.

Politics in America has become the battle of the billionaires now. You have to get a billionaire on your side in order to win. I mean, we know that whether it is the Coates', or the Mercers, or the Adelsons, or whoever it is, it is some big, rich person who is going to sponsor a political candidate, and that is who gets to represent us in what is supposed to be a democratic society. So I think that it is critical to make the link between economic inequality and political inequality.

I will say again, when we get economic inequality to the degree that it is, one of the other things that is purchased, besides political influence, is mergers and acquisitions.

I would just like to point out to everybody that it doesn't matter what industry you are talking about, markets are deeply concentrated and anti-competitive. If you are talking about like a pharmacy—not a pharmaceutical company, but a pharmacy—CVS, Walgreens, we used to have Rite Aid and, of course, they merged together. And, of course, there is another merger coming up. Every day you open the paper, there is some other big company buying up some other big company, concentrating markets, making the barriers to entry even higher so that the small-business person is just locked out.

It costs a lot to get into business now. If your opponent, who is some big, huge company, doesn't want you in the market, they can just drop their prices, suffer the losses, because they are big, run you out of business, and raise them right back on up.

But if you look at any market—beer, hamburger, chicken, online search engines, anything you want—almost all of them are deeply concentrated—two, three, maybe four—companies representing 80 or 90 percent of the industry, which cuts off opportunity, limits competition, and it is bad for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I have a few more things to share, but I will kick it back to Congressman DESAULNIER for now. Maybe he can kick it back to me a little later, and we will just have a conversation for a little while.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, that sounds good to me.

Madam Speaker, I do want to say, as a former small-business owner, having owned restaurants in the San Francisco Bay area for many years, I can definitely identify with your comments that all too often Main Street America, those entrepreneurs who employ most of our workers, are at a distinct disadvantage.

□ 1730

And, unfortunately, I always felt this as a small independent restaurant owner, that the desires of a lot of my fellow restaurateurs that were nationally owned were not necessarily my desires. I supported the community. I was

active in the community. I was in the Rotary or went to Rotary, was very active. They didn't have that kind of Main Street presence.

I do think that we have deserted that kind of—we collectively, I think, in this body, have all too often deserted that constituency, which is so much a part of not just our economy, but our culture in America.

Ben Franklin, when he started, went through and was trained by his father and his older brother. Somewhat controversially, he came to Philadelphia and walked down the street and started a business.

So, to your point, I think that is really important, that when you look at the fabric of America, what this inequality talks about—and as we go through this, it will sound from somewhat of an academic perspective because we have listened to the experts. We have listened to experts, particularly in my area in northern California at Berkeley and Stanford, but we have gone to others.

This presentation will be about what the economic history and what the economics are telling us so that everyone can accept this in terms of the historical record and the facts as Thomas Piketty put in his best selling economics book, very dry, “Capital in the Twenty-First Century,” which I take a lot of my influence from.

When the majority was going through their tax reform bill, I happened to pick up a compilation of economists—it was very broad, from their ideological perspective—called, “After Piketty”; and as I was reading this, I already knew this, and I thought this tax plan is probably the worst medicine to give this environment because it will only make it worse, in my view, based on a hopeful thought that all of this will trickle down from the wealthiest.

We know that in an economy like the United States, where 70, 75 percent of it is consumer driven, you need people to spend money. Myself, as a small-business person, if people didn't have disposable income to come in my door to pay for the food, I couldn't pay my employees. I couldn't do all the things I wanted to do to engage in the community. So this is the fabric of the American economy, but it is really about the fabric of the American culture and what we want for our kids.

One of the most disturbing things is being a baby boomer and the parent of two sons in their thirties and to see their struggles as they do well and play by the rules and do as is required of them. What we are passing on, my generation and future generations, is not just the challenge of a prospectively lower life expectancy, but all the despair we see in too many communities in this country that this last election, according to the ultimate winner in the Presidential campaign, was about reaching them.

Over a quarter into his term, I defy anyone to say where the average per-

son in multiple communities is seeing a benefit, and this is going to be a challenge.

So I put up here, there have been many famous admonitions through history, starting with Plato and Aristotle, about this issue, about the inequality issue of humans treating other humans. The first one I would like to point out because it comes from Adam Smith—Adam Smith, who wrote “The Wealth of Nations,” the great Scottish political economist whom many people in the Chicago school and people who believe in this idea of trickle-down economics look to and the invisible hand that he so famously wrote about.

But the quote on the top here, I think, is a very clear demonstration of his view in the late 1700s in spite of his perspective on many things, and it is the first quote on the chart: “The disposition to admire, and almost to worship, the rich and the powerful, and to despise, or, at least, to neglect persons of poor and mean condition is the great and most universal cause of the corruption of our moral sentiments”—Adam Smith.

The second quote is from someone whom we are all familiar with. A great American, a great Republican progressive, Teddy Roosevelt, said: “The man of great wealth owes a peculiar obligation to the state because he derives special advantages from the mere existence of government,” a quote rooted in a passage from Luke in the Bible.

That passage says and is quoted often in our political discourse: “To whom much is given, much is required.” That is part of what Jesus of Nazareth said when he was giving his gospels on the mountain as part of the Sermon on the Mount or prelude to that.

And the last quote, I think, is very demonstrative for the situation we are in and leading up to these next elections both in 2018 and 2020. The great jurist, the first Jewish American to be a member of the U.S. Supreme Court, Louis Brandeis, said: “We can either have democracy in this country or we can have great wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can't have both.”

With that, I would like to briefly go through four charts that I think are visually demonstrative of the problem we are exposed to, and I would like people who are watching to particularly look at the timeframe on the graphs.

So it has been talked about going back to when America was great. These charts will demonstrate that this period of time, that a lot of us who had parents who fought in World War II, grandparents who fought in World War I, heard their stories about that national commitment in both those instances and in both generations.

I grew up in a household outside of Lowell, Massachusetts, hearing my French-Canadian grandparents and my Irish grandparents talking about coming to Lowell, Massachusetts, to work in those textile mills for the opportunity to improve their lives and the lives of their kids.

Indirectly, of course, I benefited from that, because their kids were the first kids in their family who went to college, my parents. But they had to endure World War I, the Great Depression, and World War II, a transformative period of time that then led to what some economists will now say was really a unique period of time where there was great economic growth after the war, during the Eisenhower administration and after that, Truman through Eisenhower and beginning with Roosevelt, where everybody was benefiting.

So this great consumer economy was a benefit to everyone sharing the wealth and the historical disparities that we have come to from outside that.

So if you want to go back to the best world, the best parts of that world, acknowledging that America had real challenges there around race, and continues to have, that had to be addressed. We had real challenges around sex and sexism that had to be addressed. There were other issues about things that we needed to deal with in this country that are urgent, and we have dealt with since that time. So I don't want to make it sound like everything was wonderful. We had our challenges.

One of the great things about this country, as so many people have said, is we acknowledge our weaknesses, but we address them and aspire to move on. I would say we are at one of those points where we are particularly challenged in that regard.

So, if we could go to the first of these charts, in particular, I want you to look at the dates, because this will be consistent in the four diagrams we are going to bring up. The dates starting on the far left in the early periods, the 1920s, which actually was the gilded age, and then through to 2013.

So this particular chart talks about inequality and that historical perspective. In the United States, right now, income inequality has grown rapidly by every statistical measure for 30 years. America's top 10 percent—and this is not class warfare. This is a discussion of what the statistics tell us and what that implies for our democracy and the benefit that we all should derive as it is written in our sacred creeds in the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and also in our other great commentary.

So America's top 10 percent, approximately 32 million people, now average more than nine times as much income as the bottom 90 percent, or about 293 million people. Think of that. The top 10 percent, 32 million people, many of them got their wealth from talent and good work. Some of them have not had as much talent and hard work, and that is human nature.

But because of the policies that we have passed—and as my friend from Minnesota has alluded to, the influence in politics, in our election process, that is more extreme than it has ever been

in the history of this country. It has always been there. It has always been part of our dynamic.

Being from California, there is a famous quote from a former speaker of the State assembly that money was the mother's milk of politics, sort of a day-to-day look as a working politician, but now we are at extreme, extreme levels.

Independent expenditures, to what my friend from Minnesota talked about, in the Supreme Court decisions around *Citizens United* and *SpeechNOW*, two decisions in 2010, have created a world that this country has never seen before, where the Supreme Court decided in those two decisions by a 5-4 majority that the American public and their representatives had very limited ability to put any kind of controls over what is called independent expenditures. Those are funds that are written. And the one condition is those people who are doing that cannot communicate or be in party with the campaigns.

You can go and see how that has dramatically changed in the last cycles and will continue to get worse in this next cycle. This last cycle, the Presidential cycle, it got up to, I believe, just about \$9 billion of independent expenditures that are largely not held accountable.

So next, America's top 1 percent, roughly 3.2 million people, averaged 40 times more than the bottom 90 percent. America's top 1 percent, or one-tenth of a percent, or roughly 325,000 people, average over 198 times the income of the bottom 90 percent, or roughly 293 million people.

The top 1 percent of America's income earners have more than doubled their share of the Nation's income since the mid 20th century. This is the period post-World War II. The incomes of the top 1 percent peaked last during the 1920s, during the start of the Great Depression. So you can see this again, the concentration.

Again, people will start pounding their chest and saying: "You are starting class warfare." The numbers speak for themselves. These numbers are driven and they are attributed—if people at home want to see where we got these numbers so they are not driven by fake news, they are driven by impartial, nonpartisan constituencies. And the point is just to say that we have got a problem.

So, again, at the last peak, this gave us great social displacement, gave us, arguably, the conditions that created World War I, definitely gave us the conditions that gave us the Great Depression, gave us the conditions, fortunately, that led to Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal, and through this sweet period where the economy was growing by 5, 6 percent, and it was generating benefit across all demographics and did what Henry Ford said when he started making his Model T. He said:

I want a product that is a quality product that my workers can afford, so I want to pay my workers enough to pay for this car.

This is the sweet spot that people talk about going back to.

Now we are here. Well, if history is right and taught us anything, and what Piketty talks about in a very classic economic historian view and his view of Western democracy and economic trends, his view is these are inevitable.

This is my perspective, of course. I am not trying to put words in Dr. Piketty's mouth.

But this was sort of an anomaly, when you look through Western economic industry, according to Piketty, which was the best-selling economics book in modern history.

So that would make one wonder what comes after this, and what Piketty suggests and others suggest is there is a correction. And the question, I think, we have for this time in our history is: What kind of correction is that going to be? Is it going to be the correction that we want in this House, this sanctum sanctorum of democracy, the House of Representatives, where we battle it out, we express ourselves and our ideologies, our perspectives—our constituencies have very different world views—but we acknowledge that this is not right, this is a problem, and this is not America as we envision it or our great leaders envisioned it, whether it was Washington or Lincoln?

Lincoln once famously said:

If wages and capital are not equal, if they become different, then we have lost democracy. And if capital, in particular, gets beyond wages, we have really lost democracy.

And he also cryptically said:

I have the Confederate Army in front of me, but I have the northern banks behind me, and, honestly, I fear the latter the more.

There is nothing wrong with capital; there is nothing wrong with investment; but, from a historical perspective, this is not a healthy economy. We want a mix, and we want everybody to enjoy it.

So just to go on, between 1992 and 2002, the 400 highest incomes—that is, individuals—reported more than double, even after the dot.com bubble burst. So, corrections, they still increased more. The benefit of the recoveries after the dot.com bust and after the recession benefited, again, this disparity, the people at the top end of the spectrum. Since 1979, the before-tax incomes of the top 1 percent of America's households increased more than four times faster than the bottom 20 percent.

Through much of this introductory part, we have been talking more about everybody in the middle income, but it has really disadvantaged poor people.

□ 1745

So when we talk about doing away with healthcare or Social Services or food stamps, it is really a cruel, sort of Dickens type of bargain where people who are already suffering will suffer more.

CEO compensation. With the unions playing a smaller role than they did decades ago—and, during this period,

during the Eisenhower administration, in particular, almost a third of American workers were in a union—it was the glory days of America; but it was also the glory days, and this wasn't a coincidence, of American workers having a voice in American economy and with their employers, where they partnered.

So since then, CEO compensation and average workers have changed. With unions playing a smaller role, down to 11 percent from almost 35 percent, than they did decades ago, the gap between CEOs and workers was eight times larger in 2016 than 1980. Union participation has declined to 11 percent, as I said, from its peak in the 1940s and 1950s.

As of 2015, 100 CEOs—and I don't say that they don't have talent and capabilities, but this is just a historical fact. Since 2015, 100 CEOs had company retirement funds worth \$4.7 billion, which is a sum equal to the entire retirement savings of the 41 percent of U.S. families with the smallest retirement funds. That is just the 41 percent that don't have retirement.

So imagine that; 100 individuals, who are supposed to be not just our economic captains, they are supposed to be our social and community captains, and they were once. In the 1970s, CEO compensation was roughly about four times the median income for their workers. So if you went to Ford or Motorola, there was a different corporate culture then, a feeling of social responsibility. It still exists, but it exists in this context: Now it is almost 300 times.

So when you look at large companies that are global, think of that, of their median global employees, this is the disparity. So it is just another thing that we should be cognizant of.

Retirement savings. Workers with employer 401(k) plans have a median balance of just \$18,433.

So let's talk for a minute about paycheck income, and then I would like to ask if my colleague would like to jump back in. This will only take a second.

So paycheck income. We are talking about a few different things, but they all add up to the same thing. So what do you get? Your paycheck, if you are lucky enough to have investments in your home or in the stock market or in any other kind of investment.

Less than half of American workers actually have investments on Wall Street. So when we look at Wall Street going up, this is the disparity between what we measure as helping the economy and what is happening on Main Street.

So the average person on Main Street, who doesn't have any investment on Wall Street—and it is interesting. When Wall Street started to go down recently, it was because there were statistical reports from the Department of Labor that wages were finally coming up. It is not lost on me that Wall Street would be concerned

about inflation because wages are finally going up for American workers, which is obviously a problem.

Paycheck income. For more than three decades, wages have been stagnant. Typical American workers and the lowest-wage workers have seen little or no growth in their real weekly wages in that time. So when you consider cost of living, which is going up exponentially in areas like where I live, in the San Francisco Bay area, and these urban areas, like D.C., where young people are constantly moving to because that is where the jobs are, between 1979 and 2007, paycheck income of the top 1 percent of the U.S. earners exploded by over 256 percent; 256 percent for the top 1 percent, but stagnant for the rest of us.

While productivity has increased at a relative rate since 1948, since the 1970s, wages have not. So we are more productive than we have ever been. The American workforce is more productive, when we talk about these glory days, than they have ever been because they have accepted compromise and working with innovation to make us more productive.

We have put a second income into the household. The value of women coming into the workforce has made such a change, not just to our economy, but to our way of life. Unfortunately, as opposed to other industrialized countries, we haven't provided the infrastructure for usually the woman who comes into the workforce to replace their activities at home; so early education, high quality education, things like that, not to mention the fact of pay disparity between genders, which I will now go to.

American women are now almost as likely to work outside the home as men. So in 1973, 14 percent, if memory serves me right, of women with children were in the workforce full time; 1973. By 1994, that number had changed to 74 percent. So think of that in the context of social change; the benefit it gave us from having talented women being in the workforce and being more in the culture, but we didn't provide the infrastructure that they had provided, in my view, when they were at home raising kids and being part of the community. It was a good change for this country, but we didn't adapt to it from a public sector.

You look at the French and the Western Europeans, it didn't happen as dramatically there, but they provided the infrastructure, which we should here.

Women still make up only 27 percent of the top 10 percent of the labor income earners; so this is the glass ceiling. Among the top 1 percent of women, they make up slightly less than 17 percent of workers. At the top 1 percent level, a woman makes up only 11 percent.

Bonus pay. This is a big issue that has come in the last 20 years. In 2016, we were going to incentivize, or before that, during the Clinton administration, incentivize performance. Unfortunately, our performance wasn't tied

enough to the benefit for everybody, the economy, the company, the investors. It was more skewed toward the investors.

So in 2016, Wall Street banks—this was 2016, just recently—doled out \$24 billion in bonuses to 177,000 of largely New York Wall Street-based employees; \$24 billion for 177,000 of America's 320-plus million people and 175 million workers. This is 1.6 times the combined earnings of all 175 million Americans who work full time at the Federal minimum wage of \$7.25.

The CEO of McDonald's—when I was in the California Legislature when we were trying to raise minimum wage, we figured out they were fighting against raising it to \$15 and indexing it for inflation, but the CEO's compensation was almost \$35,000 an hour. I don't think his commitment or his quality to work was that different, and it wouldn't have been in the 1970s.

This bonus pool was large enough to have lifted all 3.2 million U.S. fast food workers or all home care aides or all restaurant servers and bartenders up to \$15 an hour.

Madam Speaker, I will take a little break if it is appropriate and yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I definitely want to thank the gentleman for the important information he has shared with us tonight. Folks who are tuned in definitely, I believe, are interested in this topic. In fact, it is the thing that most people think about.

As I am here tonight, I would say, Madam Speaker, that we just celebrated, or shall I say we just memorialized the loss of Martin Luther King, which it was his 50th anniversary of his passing, of his assassination back on April 4. And just recently, this is the year that we passed the fair housing law in 1968, so it has been 50 years.

A lot of people, when they think of King, they think, oh, he helped African Americans defeat Jim Crow segregation, and that is true. That is one way to look at it.

But when he died, he was marching with sanitation workers who were paid so little they could not make ends meet. They weren't allowed to go into adequate shelter when it was raining, so two of them, one day, happened to go into the back of the garbage truck. The garbage truck had a malfunction, and those two men were crushed in the garbage truck, and so that initiated a strike which Martin Luther King came and joined two times, it being the last fight he was ever in.

Why do I bring up this point? Because we think of America as being more evolved since that time. We think, oh, we have got voting rights; we have gotten rid of discrimination. It is illegal now.

But I will tell you what. Despite the fact that we still are battling for racial equality, we have absolutely slipped backwards in the fight for economic

empowerment for working people, no matter what their color.

In 1968, the Federal minimum wage, if it had been adjusted for inflation, would be about \$11.62. But as the gentleman just mentioned, it is now \$7.25. And the server minimum wage, the tip minimum wage is \$2.13. People don't believe me when I say that, but it is \$2.13.

How can it be legal to pay a server \$2.13? They say, oh, they make it up in tips. Do they? What if their tips aren't given to them? What if there is wage theft, which happens all the time?

I want to thank the gentleman from California for mentioning that in 1968, the average CEO got paid about 20 times more than the average worker. Today, it is above 300 percent, 300 times. So the inequality has dramatically not just enriched the rich, it has made working and middle class and the working poor suffer.

There are—and this is a shocking statistic. There has been a 60 percent growth in people living under the Federal poverty guideline since 1968. That is wrong, and this tax bill that we just passed will do nothing other than make it all that much worse.

It is a cruel irony that, in the face of this spread, this gap that working people are experiencing relative to their richer fellow Americans, that we would say, oh, you know what we need to do? Give the rich people even more money.

Now, again, I am not anti-rich. I wouldn't mind being rich myself one day. But I do hope that if I ever were to be doing well financially, that I would not pull the ladder up, climb up the ladder and then pull it up so that people can't even follow me.

Wait a minute. That is exactly what they are doing. They are trying to take away the Affordable Care Act, which actually gave millions of people healthcare for the first time. They want to put work requirements on receiving Federal benefit and aid. They want to make it tougher to be working class and poor. It is outrageous.

I just want to wrap my own comments up tonight by just saying it doesn't have to be this way. Poverty is not something that simply happens like the weather. It is not a storm and, oh, boy, how did that ever happen? No, it is a series of decisions made by people who have political power, who advantage some and disadvantage others.

It is things that we do, and it is also things that we don't do. It is when we just let markets concentrate and don't engage in legitimate anti-trust action; and it is when we pass a tax bill that we know, before anything has happened, that 83 percent of the benefits will go to the top 1 percent. This is how you create massive inequality.

There are things we can do about it. I think we could start by passing a policy that links CEO pay to raises for workers. What if a CEO thinking about, you know, I am going to get my pay, I am going to get a big fat old bonus. Oh, okay. If I do that, I have got

to make sure my folks get some of this too. What if we passed a policy like that?

What if we said you couldn't deduct those bonuses off your taxes the way that they do now?

What if we actually said to ourselves, we are going to have a very high estate tax? I think that is fair enough. I mean, what did you do, other than negotiate a birth canal, to get all that money? I think that we should reward work, not just birth.

I think, what if we said we are going to make major investments in public wealth? What do I mean by public wealth? Well, I don't know, the parks, the roads, the bridges, the transit, the schools. What if we invested in those public institutions that actually help everybody come up?

Even the rich folks can go to the public park. We don't ration that. We say it is something for all of us.

What if we said we are going to make sure that the right to join a union is a right that we are going to protect and defend, knowing that the fortunes of unions—when union density goes up, working class people do better. When union density goes down, working class people's wages stagnate and go down.

What if we lifted the minimum wage to a livable wage?

What if we had real consumer protection?

What if we said that everybody can go to the doctor?

I believe that we should have universal single-payer healthcare. That is my opinion, and I hope others join me.

What if we did things like looked at the labor policies that they have in some countries around the world?

Do you know, in Germany, Madam Speaker, that workers have to be on the board of the corporation if the corporation is above a certain size?

□ 1800

That makes sense. They certainly are affected by what the company does.

In Germany, if there is a slowdown, a recession, and that happens, everybody takes fewer hours rather than just laying off people who are just relegated to the unemployment lines, who see their skills deteriorate and who are just out of the workforce and it is hard to get back in.

What if we did these things? What if we said to ourselves that we were going to have a trade policy that really factored in how is this policy going to impact the local economy and workers? I definitely think trade is a good thing, but what if we thought about how it is going to impact this worker, these workers, this factory right here?

What if we got rid of the idea of right to work and said everybody in American can join a union?

This would make America a stronger country for working Americans. It would improve our economy. It would put money in the hands of working Americans, and it wouldn't stop people from getting rich if they got a great

idea and made a lot of money. It wouldn't stop people from amassing any wealth, but what it would do is make sure that people at the middle and the bottom of the economy had a greater shot and a better share.

My Republican friends' vision for the economy is that, look, you know, here is how you have a good economy: You don't make rich people or big companies pay any taxes, and you shuffle all the property taxes and the sales taxes. You let those things be on the shoulders of the working folk. Then you don't spend on public institutions like public schools or anything. You just let those folks do the best they can.

If those kids aren't smart enough to be born to rich parents who send them to private school, forget about it. We are just going to underfund that, or we are going to do charters, and then we will let individuals own those schools and make money off of them.

Their idea of a business model is to smash the workers down, treat the workers like a cost, push their labor costs as far down as they can get it, and amass the wealth at the top as much as they can, allow stock buybacks, and don't regulate anybody, and don't have any rules of the game so that you get a free-for-all, and then when the economy finally goes bust, oh, you know, we just go back to John Q. Taxpayer and Jane Q. Taxpayer and make them bail them out.

Anyway, I think there is a better way. I think we can have a better economy. We can have a democracy. We can have an economy that allows for free enterprise and we can have a public sector that makes sure that liberty and justice and opportunity are for everyone, not just a few.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for his passion and his commitment.

I just want to mention a couple things before I turn it over to my incredible colleague from Connecticut, who brings such passion and real insight to these issues.

But as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) said about minimum wage, in the 1960s, if you worked a full-time job and you earned the Federal minimum wage with an average amount of overtime, you earned 55 percent of the median household income nationally.

So think of that. You could work a minimum wage job in the sixties, and you could have enough to earn at least half of what the rest of your citizens were doing. So you could pay for housing. You could get by.

I know there are a lot of things, but if we had indexed that for inflation this whole time, it would be very different.

And just a few statistics on extreme poverty, because Mr. ELLISON brought this up.

So extreme poverty or absolute poverty is the definition by the economics profession. It is not limited to nations outside our borders. So we like to talk

about the rest of the world has come up from \$1 a day on average of these poor countries to \$2 a day.

To my great chagrin and shock, 3.2 million people in the United States now live on under \$2 a day. Think about that. The United States of America, 3.2 million people. This is extreme poverty that we often ascribe to very, very underdeveloped poor countries.

According to Oxford economist Robert Allen, absolute poverty in the United States is anything under \$4 a day due to the costs.

Can you imagine trying to live on \$4 a day. But, yes, over 3 million of our fellow citizens attempt to.

In comparison, let's say based on this, if you took the \$4, then you go up to 5.3 million Americans are in this economic definition of absolutely poor by global standards. There are more people in absolute poverty in the United States than in Sierra Leone or Nepal.

In comparison, zero percent of the populations of Germany, Iceland, Switzerland live in absolute poverty. Two-tenths of a percent of Great Britain and three-tenths of a percent of France live in absolute poverty, respectively.

So this is just the extreme that I think we have to hear about because too often we gloss over the issues in this Chamber of people who are really struggling, the absolutely poor, the very poor, the most vulnerable amongst us, while we correctly try to help everybody in the bottom 90 percent, particularly middle income, but we have got to help everyone.

With that, I yield to my wonderful friend from Connecticut, who is such a passionate, determined, eloquent spokesperson in this Chamber for issues around poverty and inequality.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, and I want to thank him for his commitment and passion to this issue, and for organizing this effort tonight, and to join with him and our colleague from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) to focus on the issue of income inequality.

And for those of us who serve in this institution, we have a moral obligation, a moral responsibility, to help those who are in punishing poverty.

It was more than 50 years ago, President Lyndon Johnson and a bipartisan Congress worked together to create the social safety net. And that social safety net is representative of the values of this great country where it says that it is not every man or woman for himself or herself, but it is our shared responsibility for one another, our accountability for one another, and particularly in times of need.

Their priority—their priority—bipartisan Members of this institution, was to lift families out of poverty.

Their tools?

Programs to help end hunger, creating good-paying jobs, provide affordable healthcare, guarantee a quality education for all of our children.

But, unfortunately, and I will be specific here, we have an administration,

we have a President, and we have a Speaker of this body, Mr. RYAN, who are not fighting a war on poverty. They are fighting a war on working families and the poor.

President Trump and Speaker RYAN do not value the beneficiaries of these programs. They do not value these people's lives, unless they happen to have an estate or a corporate spending account. They want corporations and the wealthiest Americans to see bigger profits, even if the poor suffer greater pain.

Republicans have repeatedly gone after the nutrition programs, the food stamp program, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid; programs that help people bounce back from tough times and to retire with dignity after a life of hard work.

When I did research for a book that was published last year, "The Least Among Us: Waging the Battle for the Vulnerable," what I found is, when it came to nutrition programs, who were the people who were engaged and involved?

Bob Dole, Republican from Kansas. George McGovern, Democrat.

When you looked at the child tax credits, George Bush was for a child tax credit, as well as Jay Rockefeller. Democrats and Republicans who came together on these issues for refundable tax credits for families to help lift them out of poverty.

When you take a look at a whole variety, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, while there may have been differences in the Chamber as they debated them, but when it came to the vote, they were passed on a bipartisan basis because, it is my view, that the folks who served there understood why they were elected and what this institution is about and how it provides opportunity for people in this country.

That is what our job is here, is to provide opportunity for the people of this country. It is about educating needy children, feeding hungry families, supporting our veterans, and shielding seniors from poverty.

Those are not the great achievements that the other side of the aisle looks at. They are grating to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It is about the view that these are the takers, not the makers; that they relax in a hammock and don't want to get up and go out to work, demeaning hard-working people in this country.

The majority in this body and in the Senate and in the White House are forcing everyday Americans to pay for their \$2 trillion tax cut for corporations and for the wealthiest Americans, and now they want to use this tax cut scam as an excuse to gut services and investments that are critical to our families and our communities.

I just want to go back for a second, because I was here. This was on the food stamp program. I was here for the Contract with America. Wow. 1995.

Do you know where it went?

Let's abolish the school lunch program. Let's block grant the food stamp

program. Let Medicare wither on the vine.

The fact is life hasn't changed that much. There is a consistency about some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Yesterday, under the guise of reviewing welfare, the Trump administration is once again targeting the most vulnerable among us.

The President's latest executive order would make it more difficult for people to access services: healthcare, nutrition, housing. A tax on our social safety net does not reflect our values, nor does it make sense at all.

The biggest issue that people are facing today is that they are in jobs that just do not pay them enough money to live on. So we must do more to end poverty and to end income inequality, and that does begin with wages.

Now, the social safety net has helped millions of Americans. According to Brookings Institution, the poverty rate has declined by more than one-third since 1967, in large part due to the success of our safety net programs. It continues to help millions. In an average month, the food stamp program benefits help feed one in four children in the United States.

What good news, then, that, Mr. Speaker, his view of what should happen is that if people are humiliated enough, that in fact they will try to figure out how to make do for themselves.

That is not what this country is about. It is a slap in the face to hard-working Americans. It is time for a better deal for Americans, one that does prioritize job creation, as you have talked about, rising incomes, a 21st century economy that levels the playing field for the working class and the working poor.

And I am reminded of the words of Bobby Kennedy, whose legacy fighting poverty should be a model for all of us, and just let me quote him. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman has read this quote, if I know him: "I believe that as long as there is plenty, poverty is evil. Government belongs wherever evil needs an adversary and there are people in distress."

This is what our role and our responsibility is, is to help to provide that opportunity. Do not let people be abandoned in this country for some ideological views or the sense that we need to make sure that the wealthiest, the millionaires, the billionaires, the corporations, need to be the winners in our society.

It is not just Congress' moral obligation to help those in poverty, it is our duty. That is why we were elected to come to this institution. We should not be abandoning the people who put their faith and trust in all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman for focusing on this issue and thank him for including me.

□ 1815

Mr. DESAULNIER. No, the thanks are all mine, my friend and colleague,

for your passion and your empathy for understanding.

Since I quoted Scripture, I just want to tell people watching, we were both raised Catholics, and a lot of that brings in the social gospel and our passion for it. I am not a Biblical scholar, so I may refer to something inaccurately.

I thank the gentlewoman for her lifetime commitment on these issues.

And how important at this critical moment where we live in this Dickens-kind of America, where we are doing so much as a survivor of cancer, both of us, and we know of the investments in the NIH and the National Cancer Institute and every other disease. There is just this strange dichotomy in this Dickens-kind of world where we are benefiting from rational, dispassionate, bipartisan efforts on that hand, and on the other hand, we let this continue to exist. And I would argue that we are making it worse in our decisions in the last 2 months. So I thank the gentlewoman for being here.

This chart, to be boring after that wonderful, compassionate moment, just talks about total wealth. So you see, the total wealth over these same periods of years for the richest 10 percent—this 15 percent is families between 10 percent and 50, so this is the 50 percent margin. And this is everything below the 50 percent.

So 50 percent of Americans are down here. The lowest 1 percent, you can see where their wealth is. Wealth inequality is ever greater than income inequality, so this is total wealth. In 1982, the poorest American listed on the Forbes list of America's richest 400 had a net worth of \$80 million, and they had a life of value. Many of those people had a very deep commitment to this country and a social commitment. I know many of those people.

That generation, across the board, had a different view of things. But it was in our corporate culture, and I would argue, unfortunately, shareholder profits has driven too many very shortsighted investments in this country, both in the private sector and certainly in the public sector.

In 2016, the richest Americans needed a net worth of \$1.7 billion to reach the Forbes 400. The average member held a net worth of \$6 billion, over 10 times the 1982 average, after adjusting for inflation.

We will go to our next chart, and then I will wrap up, Madam Speaker.

The net worth of America's top 1 percent holds nearly half of the national wealth invested in stock and mutual funds. So this goes to watching the stock market—while it is important for this country and I am not disparaging that—this disconnect, it may be going up, but does it benefit everyone?

It benefits everyone to a degree, but certainly to a lesser degree, I would argue, than it has in the past, in those years of post-World War II. The billionaires who make the Forbes 400 list now have as much wealth as all African-

American households, plus a third of America's Latino-Hispanic populations combined. In other words, 400 of our wealthiest citizens have as much wealth as 16 million African-American households, and 5 million Hispanic-Latino households.

At the end of the 20th century, the typical White family held a net worth six times greater than the typical African-American family. That gap is growing.

So this particular chart is from the work by Piketty. The blue line, as you can see, is the percentage of capital, the amount of capital as a percentage of GDP in this country, and the red line is wages. These green bars are where we have had recessions.

The important point to make in all of the slides is, the sweet spot where wages and capital were close to what Lincoln admonished us we should be, is where everybody benefited. And when you get to this, as in the Gilded Age, the concern here tonight is: What do we do about this? Do we respond, as we always have, through our civic institutions, to this institution, to this room, where Americans have struggled with these issues and come out with a product that largely benefited everyone, all Americans?

And it didn't benefit it based on any kind of demographic group. It benefited it in its best moments based on the merit of your hard work and willingness to work an honest day. Most Americans that I know, working people in my district and throughout this country that I have visited, don't ask for too much, in my view. They aspire to make enough to buy a home, to raise a family, to retire in comfort, and to leave the next generation wealthier and fuller than their generation.

We are failing in that obligation, and some of that obligation is for all of us. And I would reach out to those who are benefiting the most from this, and many of them, Warren Buffett and others, Bill Gates, have addressed this issue. But we really need them to lead us to a conversation about if this is right. If this historical record and the economic historians are right, how do we correct this? How do we correct it in such a way that is constructive and use these institutions to make sure that we improve upon this and really make America as great as it can be.

So in my opening, I talked about the Christian admonition from the Bible about to those who are given much, much is expected, required. This has been through our political liturgy, such as it is in this room and others, that there is a social obligation, a social contract. And we have an obligation to protect individual hard work and merit. Those two things are things that Americans believe in. And when they work together, they work for everyone.

The other thing that has come from many of our spiritual backgrounds is something that John Winthrop talked about when he left England and

brought those Puritans to the shore of Massachusetts to start anew, a place that I have been to many times in my youth growing up outside of Boston.

But Mr. Winthrop, future-Governor Winthrop, admonished to his shipmates, he said that where we are going, we should always be as a city upon a hill. And it comes from the Sermon on the Mount, that we should be as a city upon a hill because the rest of the world will look upon us.

It has been popular in our culture in both parties. Jack Kennedy, in a speech in 1961 before the Massachusetts legislature as President said: "We must always consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill—the eyes of all people are upon us."

Today, the eyes of all people are truly upon us—and our governments, in every branch, at every level, national, State and local, must be as a city upon a hill.

Kennedy continued and finished by saying history will not judge us, and I would say that this is true for us today, here.

Kennedy said: "History will not judge our endeavors—and a government cannot be selected—merely on the basis of color or creed or even party affiliation. Neither will competence and loyalty and stature, while essential to the utmost, suffice in times such as these."

Kennedy concluded: "For those to whom much is given, much is required."

And I conclude with Ronald Reagan who talked about a city on a hill often. He talked about it on the eve of his election in 1980. And as his farewell address, his last address to the country in the Oval Office on January 11, 1989, Reagan said: "I've spoken of the shining city all my political life, but I don't know if I ever quite communicated what I saw when I said it. But in my mind it was a tall, proud city built on rocks stronger than oceans, windswept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and peace; a city with free ports that hummed with commerce and creativity."

And Reagan concluded by saying: "And if there had to be city walls, the walls had doors and the doors were open to anyone with the will and the heart to get here. That's how I saw it, and see it still."

Ronald Reagan was right. Jack Kennedy was right. We should be as a city on a hill. And with the inequality we currently have in this country, I would argue the rest of the world does not look at us that way.

If we want to fulfill those obligations handed down to us through Scripture and our own political scripture, we have to have the courage and the confidence to address these issues in this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, I yield back.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I come into the conclusion of a very interesting day and week. Our current Speaker of the House, of course, has announced that he is not going to be seeking reelection. I think he made it clear before he was elected Speaker that he really wasn't seeking the position. He didn't really want the position. He had other things in mind. He enjoyed his chairmanship, but he ended up stepping up to the plate, being elected Speaker. And for his willingness to serve, he is to be applauded.

I have appreciated having a Speaker who, even when we disagreed, I knew he always tried to be honest and was somebody that wanted to do the right thing. So I appreciate that very much. We hadn't always had that, and I appreciated having that from Speaker PAUL RYAN.

Some of my colleagues have said: "Gee, Louie, we have gotten calls saying you ought to run for Speaker again." And so I really appreciate that, but I need to make clear: Back in December of 2014, after the Speaker—at that time, John Boehner—had pushed through a CR/Omnibus bill that immediately broke many of the promises that got Republicans elected back to the majority in November of 2014, after the promises, so many of our promises and the Speaker's promises were broken in that December 2014 CR/Omnibus, a number of us realized, we have got to have a new Speaker. We can't go through 2 years like this, these kinds of outrageous, broken promises with the country suffering under ObamaCare, so many problems that were before us.

So we began to try to get enough Republicans. We did the numbers. We knew that if all of the Republicans voted, we needed 29 Republicans to vote for any living person to be Speaker who was not the current Speaker, John Boehner.

And we tried for like 3 weeks. We couldn't get more than nine people to agree to vote for someone other than John Boehner. The vote was coming up on the House floor on Tuesday, and on Friday night I got a call from THOMAS MASSIE and JIM BRIDENSTINE, two of the finest people who ever served in Congress—two of the smartest as well, people of real integrity. And THOMAS said, "Louie, Jim had a brilliant idea, and we need to talk to you about it."

And JIM BRIDENSTINE, who, like I say, was brilliant, served our Nation in the Air Force, graduated from Rice University, which has rather high standards of intelligence to be admitted. And JIM said: "Hey wait, Thomas, would you repeat that part about a guy from Rice having a brilliant idea, you being a guy from MIT?"

And anyway, they got on and they said: "We are stuck with nine people. We can't get past nine people. We need

29 Republicans to vote for somebody besides Speaker Boehner.” And if we can get to 29, of course, that was our goal. The whole goal, though—to make a full disclosure—the plan was, if we could get 29 Republicans to vote for somebody besides John Boehner, then that would throw it into a second ballot for the first time since 1923.

□ 1830

There was some point back in the 1800s, mid-1800s, when they had over 60 ballots cast before they elected a Speaker. But that was a goal, and we knew if we got 29 and we got to a second ballot, then we could call for an emergency conference among the Republicans, go down and meet in HC-5 downstairs, and we knew the 29 of us would be belittled, fussed at, and yelled at.

I could say: Look, you can yell at us and call us whatever names you want, but we are not changing our vote. So let's agree to a compromise Speaker.

By that afternoon, we expected to have a compromise Speaker. There were a number of potential people who would have been acceptable. That was the plan.

THOMAS, JIM, and I, all three, knew that if I announced, then there would be an awful lot of people in our party who would hate me for the rest of my life or their life, whichever came first. The point that THOMAS and JIM made was that we have a number of our Members who have been hearing from constituents who have said: Look, we want you to vote for somebody besides John Boehner for Speaker. There had been a poll done that showed that, as I recall, 61 percent of nationwide Republican voters across the country wanted somebody besides John Boehner as Speaker.

So as some of our Members heard from constituents saying to vote for anybody but Boehner. They said: I would. I would vote for anybody but John Boehner if someone else formally announced. But no one has formally announced, so I am not just going to throw my vote away, and that would satisfy their constituents.

THOMAS' and JIM's point was that, if you announce, then they will hear from all of those thousands of constituents saying: Hey, you said if somebody announced, and now a Republican has announced, so keep your promise and vote for somebody besides Boehner.

The thinking of THOMAS and JIM was that, if we do that and you announce, then that would make those guys so uncomfortable that had been promising I would vote for anybody but Boehner if somebody announces, that we could finally get to the 29. We have been stuck on nine for weeks now.

So I had asked them to let me give it some thought overnight. The next morning, there was a conference call already scheduled with all nine of us. I said: Let's talk about it in the morning and give me a chance to think about it.

What occurred to me is what I told the other eight Members who had

agreed to vote for somebody besides the current Speaker, John Boehner: Look, guys, I have given this a lot of thought. If I am the only one who announces, then you will have both mainstream media and you will have Republican and Democratic reporters casting this as an election between this crazy guy from Texas, even though I feel quite certain that I scored much, much higher than my opponent would have at that time. They will say that he is crazy, and poor John Boehner is dealing with this crazy guy.

I said that what occurred to me is that, if one of you guys sent out word that you were announcing, then I could ask FOX News if I could come on to announce, and during the announcement I could make clear that this isn't about me being Speaker. It is about getting a different Speaker. So-and-so announced yesterday; somebody else may announce tomorrow. It is about getting a new Speaker.

TED YOHO said: Well, LOUIE, if that is all it will take to get you to announce, I will send out an announcement this afternoon announcing that I am running for Speaker.

I said: Okay. TED, if you announce you are running for Speaker, send out that announcement today. As soon as it goes out, I will call FOX News to see if I can come on.

That all happened. TED sent out the press release. I called FOX News, and they let me on early that morning. I made it back from Dallas to Tyler in time to go to church, and the struggle was on.

But I knew, and all eight of our other patriot Republicans in the House knew, that by my announcing formally as a candidate for Speaker, which would bring about so much response from their constituents demanding that Members vote for somebody besides Boehner now that somebody has formally announced, those people who were made to feel very uncomfortable because of my announcement and the wrath they heard from constituents, some would probably never forgive me and would be angry with me. It would mean that I would never be able to be elected to any position. Even if we had a dogcatcher in the House, I could never get elected to that after I worked to have made that many people angry.

And I made a lot of people angry. People were calling by the thousands up here. I had many Members tell me they had gotten over 1,000 calls from constituents saying: Vote for LOUIE.

There was one article that got it right, that reported accurately that I was overheard a number of times saying: Look, guys, you know that Boehner is going to be mad at you if you don't vote for him; but you know he is going to be doubly mad at you if you vote for me because of how strongly he feels about me. So vote for anybody. You pick a living person and name them as your vote. We have got to have 29. If we get 29, we will have a compromise candidate for Speaker. Clear-

ly, it would never be me after I made that many people angry.

So overnight, Sunday night, we started getting new people to pledge that they were willing to vote for someone besides Boehner. I encouraged people to vote for somebody besides me so you don't make Boehner totally mad.

JIM BRIDENSTINE said: LOUIE, I am going to nominate you on the floor, and all I would ask is that you at least vote for yourself if I am going to nominate you so that I am not the only one voting for you.

He had been hearing me tell others to vote for anybody but me; it is fine. We just need to get to 29.

So I said: Absolutely, JIM. If you are gutsy enough to stand up and nominate me for Speaker, I will absolutely vote for myself so that you don't look, in some way, lame.

I will always treasure and appreciate the words that JIM BRIDENSTINE said and the things that he spoke during his nomination, even during so much of the uproar against me by some of my colleagues. It still warms my heart to hear what JIM BRIDENSTINE had to say here on the floor about me.

He has been nominated by our President to be head of NASA. BRIDENSTINE is probably one of the smartest people to be named as head of NASA. He has been in the sky. He has served his country nobly and well, both flying planes and flying the rules of the House here in Congress. He would be an absolutely incredible asset to NASA and to this country once he is confirmed.

I had asked some other people—I imagine JIM knows—but what I have heard from other people is that it is not the Democrats who have a hold on JIM BRIDENSTINE for head of NASA; it is actually our own Senator MARCO RUBIO. Now, that is what I was told by some people I trust.

If that is the case, I know that BRIDENSTINE didn't support Senator RUBIO in the primary for President, but BRIDENSTINE is one of the finest, most qualified, and most intelligent people we could ever hope to have as head of NASA. If what I was told is true, that for some reason MARCO RUBIO has a grudge against JIM BRIDENSTINE, I hope that he will do the right thing, put that grudge aside, whatever it is, and get this incredibly noble and qualified man into being head of NASA. We can't keep hurting our country with these kinds of actions by Republicans.

So I appreciate very much, Madam Speaker, people calling and encouraging me to run for Speaker, but I knew exactly when I announced for Speaker before, there would be people who would likely never forgive me for making their lives so uncomfortable. I had a goal. I just knew in my soul, if we didn't get a new Speaker soon, we would lose the majority at the end of 2016.

If Congress had been in such dismal shape in 2016, it would have hurt any chance we had of possibly winning the

Presidency. I just knew this country was in such rough shape that we had to do that. Even though it meant people hating me and being angry at me for years to come, it was worth it to try to help my country. I was willing to do that.

So I appreciate the calls, and I appreciate the encouragement, but I was willing to sacrifice any possibility that I would ever be elected to anything by other Members of Congress in order to get a different Speaker.

We ended up with PAUL RYAN, and despite our disagreement on some things, I knew he was always trying to be honest, and I will always appreciate that. We all know that we did not lose the majority in the House and our failure under Speaker Boehner did not hurt us and keep us from being able to elect a Republican President. So I think those are good things that arose out of it, but now we need to be looking ahead for the future.

I do think that people—unlike me—who might have a chance to be elected Speaker and who have not done things like anger my colleagues by announcing back in 2015, people who have a chance need to put together a plan of action, something like a Contract with America, not a farce like was put together that Speaker Boehner helped direct, which was the Pledge to America. As soon as we were elected after that pledge, the pledge was abandoned by Speaker Boehner.

We need an agreement: You reelect us to the majority, here are the things we are going to do, and then do them.

I appreciate what my friend THOMAS MASSIE said to a reporter earlier this afternoon. The reporter was demanding of Congressman MASSIE what he saw would ultimately be the result of a race for Speaker. THOMAS MASSIE said: Well, I see this race for Speaker a lot like NASCAR. There are many, many laps to go, and I am sure there will be some spectacular crashes before we finish that race.

So I think that could very well be the case. There are many, many laps to go in the race for Speaker that we didn't even know about until this morning, and THOMAS is probably right. There will probably be some spectacular crashes along the way in that race to be Speaker. We just need people who believe in the power of prayer to be praying for an honest and honorable Speaker who will follow the right plan, and then we will go from there.

Also, I want to touch on this incredible investigation not of a crime—we have long since gotten past a special counsel, Special Counsel Mueller, investigating a crime which, under laws and regulations, is a requirement to even appoint a special counsel. You have to have a crime in order to have a special counsel. As we found out, there was no crime that could be pointed to, yet they raised the question maybe the Trump campaign somehow colluded with Russia.

As we have heard from Comey and so many others, there is no evidence of

Donald Trump colluding with Russia or the Trump campaign to change the outcome of the election.

□ 1845

So what the special counsel's job has morphed into, illegally, I might add, is the special counsel no longer being in pursuit of a specified crime in the appointment of special counsel to investigate; but he now has a person target, Donald Trump, and he has taken his job to be search everything you can, now raid his lawyer's office so that you can try to find some crime unrelated to Donald Trump that you could use in evidence to prove against his lawyer, Michael Cohen.

And then, once we have found sufficient crimes, we will tell Michael Cohen: Okay, we have got evidence that will put you in prison for life, or 1,000 years, whatever they are going to do, unless you agree to tell us something—don't care if it is true or untrue; we need you to say it is true—that Donald Trump committed a crime, and then we won't prosecute you.

That has to be what that big raid was all about, because even if Donald Trump told his attorney, Mr. Cohen, anything that had to do with a potential crime for which Mr. Cohen was representing him, they could not introduce that. That would be privileged, covered by the attorney/client relationship, the privilege. I know absolutely, without any question in my mind, that Donald Trump never made a question admitting guilt in anything because he certainly convinced me that he is not guilty of anything. Nothing that has been proven.

But as The Heritage Foundation established in recent years, there are so many laws that carry criminal penalties that incorporate regulations that unelected bureaucrats have put in place so that if you violate a regulation, then you could be convicted, put in prison.

We have had hearings in prior years in Judiciary Committee. The estimate is probably over 5,000 Federal crimes. And we are not even sure how many there are, but probably over 5,000. And so many of them incorporate regulations: If you violate the regulation promulgated by this agency or department, then you are guilty of a crime, and you can go to prison.

So we heard some horror stories; such as, the gentleman, nerd, up in the northwest trying to create some kind of new, better battery. And he knew the laws and the requirements how to take care of chemicals, and he was very fastidious in doing that, followed the law, legal requirements, on keeping chemicals that he used to try to develop this battery. And one day he is driving along in his little fuel-efficient, small car, and he has three suburbans swoop up: one behind, one in front, one to the side. They force him off the road. They grab him out of his little car, throw him to the ground, boot in the back, handcuff him. He had no idea

what he had done, and he didn't learn for quite some time.

But he had sent some chemical to Alaska to be used to help research what he was trying to establish in making a new battery. This was my understanding from the testimony we had at the hearing. So, since he was sending something by mail to Alaska, then, under venue statutes, that allowed the U.S. attorney to prosecute either in his home State, in the continental U.S., or in Alaska; and since he really wasn't friends with anybody in Alaska, they drug him up to Alaska, threw him in jail there with a high bond for no reason other than the Justice Department being ruthless.

And they tried this man for committing the heinous crime of violating a regulation that required, if someone sent this particular substance through the mail, it had to go by ground. He knew that. He checked the box to mail by ground only. He didn't realize that even when you check the box "by ground only" there was a regulation that said that wasn't good enough; you also had to get this Federal stamp to put on there that had a picture of an airplane with a line across the airplane so that it wasn't supposed to be taken in the air.

He got thrown to the ground, badly abused, taken to jail in Alaska, tried for a Federal felony because he didn't put a little sticker on with a plane with a line through it. Well, the jury did the right thing. They did a jury nullification and found him not guilty, although technically he was guilty of not putting that little sticker on there. They felt like he had been punished enough. They found him not guilty.

So he was ready to go home, but the Justice Department was so angry that he had been acquitted that they looked for anything to try to keep him incarcerated. And what they came up with was another statute that said, if anyone ever leaves certain substances unattended for so many days, then they are strictly liable, they are guilty of a Federal felony of abandoning these chemicals. And there is no defense for the fact that you were kept away from those chemicals 100 percent involuntarily, against your will.

So, as I understood from what we got at our hearing, he ended up being convicted of abandoning these chemicals, even though he didn't abandon them. The Justice Department was guilty of that, not him. But those were the regulations. They were properly stored, but he was forced to go to Alaska. He couldn't stay there with his chemicals, and he went to prison for that.

Now, I bring all that up to say that there are probably thousands of cases like that. We heard about a number of others. And The Heritage Foundation's point was that probably most Americans have committed Federal felonies we don't even know about because of some technical violation like that gentleman had that ended up with him being incarcerated for 18 months or so.

So if we abandon the constitutional approach to proving crimes in America that you are innocent until proven guilty and that judges are not allowed to give search warrants, or even arrest warrants, unless—well, for search warrants, under the Fourth Amendment, items are described with particularity that are to be searched for, and the area to be searched is identified with particularity. You have got to be specific.

And in this case, we have a special counsel who is out of control. I have told the President, I have said in the media: Mueller should be investigated himself. And I can't help but think that Rosenstein, as deputy attorney general, and Mueller, as special counsel, are running out the clock on statutes of limitation for any crimes they may have committed in stifling the investigation under Rosenstein's control as U.S. attorney and Mueller's control as FBI Director into Russia trying to gain control over American uranium.

And we also know that Comey has admitted he leaked information, which should be pretty easy to prove is a crime. He admitted it. He should be investigated. Each time Mueller's special counsel team has leaked information, it most likely has been a crime as well, for which Mueller needs to be investigated and held to account.

Each time there has been a leak about the President that contained information that it was a crime to leak, Mueller should have been all over that. But the trouble, we know, if he were to be investigating the most obvious crimes being committed, then he would be most likely under arrest himself.

We need to know: Rosenstein and Mueller, were they complicit in helping ensure that Russia would end up with such a sizable amount, 20 percent or so, of our uranium? They had a person under cover that was giving them information showing that Russians were committing crimes; and, as far as we can tell, they made sure nothing was done so that nothing would prevent some of the Cabinet members approving the sale of U.S. uranium. That needs to be investigated.

The leaks that we know have been committed that are crimes, they need to be investigated. Obviously that is going to take a second counsel, a special counsel. And no, even appointing a current U.S. attorney somewhere to investigate the special counsel and Comey and Rosenstein, it is going to have to be outside of the current Justice Department, outside the current U.S. attorney.

And it seems pretty clear to me, no one would need as many of the heartless prosecutors as Mueller has hired. It is obvious he is on a witch hunt. Seemed pretty obvious to some of us that, by his outrageous activity in raiding a lawyer's office, he was probably hoping the President would fire Mueller. That is an indication he really doesn't have anything; he has gotten desperate and is trying to manipulate

lawyer Cohen and, in the alternative, trying to get evidence that they could use to squeeze Cohen to get him to testify, even creating a crime if he has to. That seems pretty serious.

But you look at the history of what Robert Mueller has been engaged in, the way he destroyed the life of Ted Stevens. He probably would still be a Senator today and be alive were it not for Robert Mueller's FBI.

□ 1900

And what of the supervising FBI agent who we found out had helped manufacture evidence and hid evidence that proved Ted Stevens was innocent—not just a reasonable doubt, definitely proving he was innocent? Well, she continued on with the FBI. I don't know if she is still with them, but the person who was the whistleblower was run out of the FBI pretty quickly. He was notified he would not be allowed to investigate any more criminal cases, which means he has got to get out.

So Mueller made sure the guilty, malicious prosecuting FBI agent was rewarded and the honest, honorable FBI agent was punished. We saw what he did to Dr. Hatfill, who was not guilty of any crime, yet Mueller was incessant in trying to establish that he was guilty for a number of years without any proof whatsoever. And that is, of course, why Dr. Hatfill ended up with a \$6 million or so settlement from the Federal Government.

But the great consistent thing about Robert Mueller—no matter how many lives he destroys, how many people, like the two in Boston who died in prison of a crime that Mueller's FBI agents he was supervising had totally framed—he was still there at the end trying to keep them from being paroled, even till eventually they ended up with a \$100 million-plus settlement—but no matter how many lives he destroys, how many people he pushes for malicious prosecution, how many businesses he may jeopardize, his great consistency is he never apologizes. It doesn't matter who he destroys or what he destroys. He won't ever apologize.

And you got to really admire a guy who is so strong-headed that despite any crimes that he or those working for him may commit or people who may die, as happened at Boston as he refused to adequately investigate the—twice, the tip that was given twice by Russia that the older Tsarnaev was a radical Islamist and going to kill people. Under Mueller, he made sure that FBI agents purged the training material, and then he made sure that—from what agents have told me, they make you, as an FBI agent, feel like that if you receive a complaint or a notice that an American citizen has noticed suspicious activity by somebody who says appears to be a practicing Muslim, but they are gathering guns, maybe gathering materials to build bombs or like the guns out in San Diego, what Mueller made sure his agents were

trained to know when they got a complaint about a potential radical Islamist threat is it tells you that the person making the complaint or giving the information about a potential radical Islamist terrorist is an Islamophobe and you really need to investigate the person making the complaint about or giving the information about the potential terrorist, that is who you need to investigate. As I have been told by former FBI agents, it was like Mueller made us look under every rock for Islamophobes rather than looking for radical terrorists.

What a legacy. It will be in history books in years to come. Not current ones. Because as long as the Federal Government is involved in education, history is not taught, and when it is, so often it is not taught appropriately, but perhaps it is after the rise and fall of the United States, but at some point history books will record how amazing it was that America could select a special counsel who had done so much damage, blinding the FBI of its ability to see what a radical Islamic terrorist was doing, and maliciously prosecuting people, and they are going to say: Are these potential indications of the fall of the civilization that rewards people who are not actually defending the country but prosecuting patriots within the country? It is a very interesting time.

I don't think we have to get to that. I think if we can get a second special counsel to investigate Comey; his mentor and bosom buddy, Robert Mueller; and Mr. Rosenstein—I mean, for heaven's sake, we find out that Mr. Rosenstein not only was involved in the Russian investigation, knew that they were trying to illegally obtain U.S. uranium, but that he also signed at least one of the requests for a warrant extension on a Trump campaign member, even when he knew that it was salacious allegations, that the allegations were not verified, and that the Clinton campaign was behind the production, as was a foreign intelligence agent out for hire who also hated Donald Trump.

So, I mean, for heaven's sake, Mr. Rosenstein obviously committed at least one fraud upon the FISA court, which brings me back around again to the point: I think it is time to get rid of the FISA courts. Let's go back to having Federal courts that can be trusted but just can't make everything secret.

Let's make sure that we have a legitimate judge who can't be sure that everything will be so secret that he or she feels comfortable just granting 99.9 percent of the requests. I know I have read the one that was made for a warrant to get Verizon to disclose all of its information about all of its customers; and when I read the affidavit that came out from WikiLeaks and I read the application, I was astonished.

It burst my bubble of thinking we could trust the FISA courts because there was no particularity. It said, just

basically, we don't know of any crimes being committed, but we do need every Verizon customers' records, and that is what the application said. Yeah, we just need every—we need a warrant to require Verizon to give us every customers' records, all the records they have got.

And the judge, a nominated and confirmed Federal judge just signed off on it. Oh, sure, you want every record. No crime has been committed. There is no particularity of describing a particular thing to be seized or a person who has committed a crime or anything like that, just give us all the records you have got on everybody you got records on. And the FISA court judge just signed it.

Again, I come back to the fact: any judge—Federal, State, or local—who has lawyers come before that court and commit a fraud upon the court, as blatant as was committed in extending, getting a search warrant and continuing a search warrant on a member of the Trump campaign, even though it was such a brief time, and four times they got that warrant, extended three times, apparently, and the judges are not outraged enough to call the lawyers to account?

Well, we find out at least one of the parties involved was apparently dear friends with the Federal judge, so I guess, to that Federal judge, if you are a dear friend and you lie to the judge or you participate in the fraud upon the court, it is okay, because you are friends; whereas, an honorable, up-right, honest American would be outraged that a friend would participate in a fraud upon the court.

But until we can see that the FISA courts can be trusted, I think we need to come back to that issue. We need to redesign courts. Yes, I know there are agents in this world who want to destroy the United States of America and our freedom, and some things would need to be done in camera, some records would need to be sealed, but we can't keep doing this where FISA judges can make outrageously unconstitutional rulings, granting warrants, and no accountability.

And the thing here is, I would be saying this if this were being done to a Democrat. I would be saying this if it were done, you know, to anybody. It is just so wrong, and I am hoping that eventually, at some point, some of my friends across the aisle will say: Wait a minute, we can't keep allowing the United States Department of Justice to be spying on American citizens. We surely can go a ways further as a nation before we become quite so Orwellian as has occurred in the FISA court and in this special counsel vilification of individuals.

They have got their person. Now, I am sure they would be pleased to indict the President if they could find that perhaps he ever mailed a substance that didn't have the little sticker with the airplane on it with a line through it. They are looking for anything they

can get. It is like Eric Holder said recently in an interview: I know Robert Mueller, and he won't stop until he gets something on Trump—something like that.

I think he is right. It is time to fire Rosenstein. It is time to have Rosenstein, Mueller, and Comey investigated. It is time to get down to what we know has been occurring, that it so clearly appears to be Federal felonies.

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

PROTECT AMERICAN CONSUMERS AND DEFEND THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAETZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, thank you so much. We are here today to declare our strongest resolve and determination to protect American consumers and defend the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

The Bureau is under assault by the current administration, the Republican administration, and we will do everything in our power to guard it and to protect it so that it can protect consumers.

I am pleased to stand here with Democratic House members of the Financial Services Committee and of the Joint Economic Committee. I would like to thank Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS for her leadership and for working collaboratively with me to organize this important Special Order.

□ 1915

It is fitting that the Financial Services Committee Democrats lead efforts to protect the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, because we created it in 2009 when we passed the landmark Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, known as Dodd-Frank for Senator Chris Dodd and our former colleague and chairman, Barney Frank.

It is also fitting that Democratic House Members of the Joint Economic Committee participate because the attack on the CFPB not only hurts consumers, but harms businesses and our overall broader economy.

Let's put things in historical perspective. During the last 2 years of the George W. Bush administration, we suffered what former Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke called "the worst financial crisis in global history, including the Great Depression."

The former Chair of the Joint Economic Committee for President Obama, Christina Roamer, said that the economic shocks during that period were five times greater than the Great Depression.

In the last month of the Bush Presidency alone, our economy lost over 800,000 private sector jobs. We were

hemorrhaging 800,000 jobs a month. Nearly \$13 trillion in household wealth was completely lost. Home values plunged, on average, by almost 20 percent. Millions of people lost their homes. And at the peak of the recession, unemployment reached 10 percent. African-American unemployment reached almost 17 percent, and Latino unemployment was 13 percent.

In short, millions of Americans lost their jobs and millions lost their homes. At the root of the economic crisis were bad mortgages sold to families that could not afford them, a lack of consumer protections to shield Americans from financial predators.

No single government agency was dedicated to protecting consumers. They were dedicated to protecting banks and other financial institutions. But often consumer concerns was a secondary thought, a third thought, or not thought about at all.

So Democrats wrote and passed into law the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, and at the heart was the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Its sole purpose was to prevent this type of economic disaster and to protect consumers.

Consumers want and need protection. The Federal Government sets and enforces safety standards on a wide variety of consumer goods. But until 2010, with the passage of the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, there were few protections for consumers of financial products—and many, many abuses.

Senator ELIZABETH WARREN, in her groundbreaking article, called for the creation of an agency dedicated solely to protecting consumers of financial products, pointed out the absurdity of not protecting consumers:

"It is impossible to buy a toaster that has a one-in-five chance of bursting into flames and burning down your house. But it is possible to refinance an existing home with a mortgage that has the same one-in-five chance of putting the family out on the street. . . ."

What is good enough for toasters and washing machines and cars, she argued, is good enough for mortgages. And it certainly would help our people. She was right. And that is a primary reason that we must defend the original mission of the CFPB today.

Ranking Member WATERS will describe some of the excellent work of the CFPB, which they have done to protect consumers.

Three numbers bear pointing out: In the first 6 years, the CFPB handled more than 1.2 million complaints and has delivered almost \$12 billion—billion, as in B—in relief, and sent that money back to consumers for their use in their pockets and their homes, to nearly 30 million consumers who had been harmed.

My Republican colleagues call this "regulatory overreach" or government run amuck. They want the CFPB to be less aggressive. In other words, they don't want the CFPB there to protect

and help consumers. In fact, it is doing exactly what it is intended to do: protect ordinary Americans against financial predators.

I dare opponents of the CFPB to inform those 30 million Americans who have received almost \$12 billion in relief of their plans to weaken the agency. For those who want to neuter the CFPB and consumer protections, it is outrageous, it is wrong, and Democrats are going to fight this like you would never believe.

I would like to draw your attention to one very important function of the CFPB: enforcing the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights, the CARD Act, which I am proud to have authored.

The CARD Act prevents what were some of the worst abuses of the credit card industry. It used to be almost out of control. You couldn't walk on the floor or down the street without people coming up to you and telling you stories about credit card abuses.

The bill was common sense. It cut out unfair, deceptive, anticompetitive actions by restricting fees. It protected consumers against retroactive rate increases on existing balances. In order to increase the rate, the consumer had to opt in and agree to an increased rate.

What happened before is they would be told you can buy a car for \$8,000 at a 6 percent interest rate. They would buy the car, then all of a sudden the rate was up to 20 percent, 30 percent, and consumers were caught in a never-ending cycle of debt.

This bill requires the lenders to alert consumers of any rate increases, prevents double billing, and prevents lying. If you say your rate is one rate, then that is what the rate has to be. It prevents credit card companies from raising credit limits for people who can't repay the debt.

In 2016, the CFPB report found that the CARD Act alone saved American consumers over \$12 billion. That is 12 billion, as in B. I call it the Democratic stimulus plan because it kept the money in the consumers' hands and not in fees that were unfair.

But it is not enough just for the CARD Act to exist. It also has to be enforced. Enforcement of existing laws has been a critical function of the CFPB.

Few would deny that the CFPB has been very effective. That is why I believe the opponents, the Republican majority and others, are attacking it.

The Trump administration has launched an assault on the CFPB. President Trump illegally appointed a man to head the CFPB who once said that he wished it didn't exist. As a Member of Congress, he sponsored a bill to abolish it.

Now, why would you put someone in charge of an agency who says they want to abolish it, unless you want to abolish it?

This follows in the pattern of other appointments in this administration: putting people in charge of an agency that they fundamentally oppose.

Now that Mick Mulvaney runs the CFPB, he is taking radical steps to make it ineffective. This means weakening consumer protections and restricting enforcement.

We had a hearing today at the Financial Services Committee this morning, and I asked him how many enforcement actions he has taken since he has started as the Acting Director for 5 months? His answer was none, zero.

Now, under the former Director, Richard Cordray, the Bureau took roughly 70 enforcement actions. They were bringing one roughly every week to protect consumers. But now, under Mulvaney, they are bringing absolutely none.

Weakening the CFPB and loosening consumer protections will make tens of millions of American families vulnerable. But it will also affect the economy via an indirect route.

A lack of effective protections will make it difficult for consumers to differentiate good products from bad. Reputable financial institutions that treat their consumers fairly—and there are many of them—will suffer with this uncertainty, and they will be incentivized to copy their disreputable competitors in a race to the bottom.

In this way, weak consumer protections can slow economic growth. As it turns out, what is good for consumers is also good for the economy.

We have other people who are here to speak, but I do want to say that, in some ways, at the heart of a financial crisis was a lack of consumer protection. Predatory lenders were able to sell bad mortgages. It was immensely profitable. They were what we called NINJA loans for people with no income, no job, and no assets.

In New York, they used to say that, if you can't afford your rent, go out and buy a house; it is easy to do. They were handing out bad loans and then securitizing mortgages on the secondary market, which were destined to fail. And they bought insurance—default swaps—to supposedly eliminate risk, which, in fact, only made it riskier. A giant wave of mortgage defaults ignited the financial crisis, leading to the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

Economists have said over and over again we could have saved our economy from this terrible \$15 trillion loss of home values and home assets if we just had good management and protection of consumers. And it all began with a mountain of bad mortgages, many of them unfair and predatory. If the CFPB had existed at that time and if it had implemented current mortgage standards, we would not have had that financial crisis.

So I would say Mick Mulvaney and other opponents of the CFPB should have learned a lesson from the catastrophic financial crisis that caused many Americans to lose their homes and their jobs, and we are still recovering.

The philosopher, George Santayana, said that those who forget the past are

destined to repeat it. So now the effort by the Republican majority to roll back the protections from the Wall Street Reform Act and to roll back the protections from the CFPB are increasing the probability of another catastrophe. We don't want that to happen, and that is why we defend Dodd-Frank, and that is why we will fight to oppose efforts, in any way, shape, or form, to weaken the CFPB.

Why in the world would anyone want to weaken protections for working men and women?

Now, one of the great leaders in this country for working men and women and for fair treatment under the laws of our country is the esteemed ranking member of the Financial Services Committee from the great State of California, Ms. MAXINE WATERS, a tireless advocate for consumers and the work of the CFPB. She has led Democrats on numerous efforts to maintain the structure, independence, and power of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau so that it can continue working for you, working for the people, the American families, the consumers that we have in our country.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member.

□ 1930

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for helping to make sure that we come to the floor this evening so that we can speak up for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, along with my Democratic colleagues on the Financial Services Committee, to discuss a central component of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, I really want to thank my colleague, Mrs. MALONEY, for organizing this event with me tonight. Mrs. MALONEY is a valuable member of the Financial Services Committee and she is also a leader on the Joint Economic Committee, she serves on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

She is a very, very busy Member of this Congress, and I don't know exactly how she finds time to do everything that she does, but I am so grateful for the opportunity to serve with her, because of her dedication and her commitment, not only to her constituents, but to the citizens of this country, and particularly focused on consumer protection.

The Consumer Bureau is vitally important in protecting American consumers from unfair, deceptive, or abusive practices by financial institutions all across the country.

Following the financial crisis, Congress created the Consumer Bureau in order to ensure that Americans have a regulator solely focused on ensuring that they are not preyed on by bad actors. The need for such an agency was

made very clear by the 2008 crisis, which was driven by unchecked, deceptive, predatory lending that caused millions of American families to lose their homes.

The Consumer Bureau has been an enormous success, and under the leadership of Richard Cordray, the agency worked exactly as we intended it to. The Consumer Bureau has returned nearly \$12 billion to over 30 million consumers who have been harmed by financial institutions. The agency has also addressed more than 1.2 million consumer complaints about financial institutions.

But now Donald Trump has moved to “do a big number on Dodd-Frank” and undermine the Consumer Bureau. Despite the fact that the Dodd-Frank statute is very clear that the deputy director of the Consumer Bureau shall serve as acting director in the absence or unavailability of the director, President Trump illegally appointed his Office of Management and Budget Director, Mick Mulvaney, to serve as acting director. Because Mr. Mulvaney serves at the pleasure of the President as OMB Director, President Trump now has an inappropriate level of influence over the operations and activities of the Consumer Bureau, which is an independent agency that is supposed to be outside of the authority of the executive branch.

Since his illegal appointment, Mr. Mulvaney has indeed been carrying out President Trump’s harmful agenda and working to reverse much of the important progress that the agency has made. This is not surprising given that Mulvaney previously stated, “I don’t like the fact that the CFPB exists,” and even called the Consumer Bureau a sick, sad joke.

In his short time at the Consumer Bureau, Mr. Mulvaney has stripped the Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity of its enforcement and supervisory powers, in a move that badly weakens the agency’s ability to crack down on discriminatory lending. He has also taken zero public enforcement actions against financial institutions that harm consumers across the board during his tenure, even though his predecessor, Richard Cordray, initiated hundreds.

In addition, Mr. Mulvaney has taken a series of actions that benefit predatory payday lenders, including the decision to halt implementation of the Consumer Bureau’s sensible payday rule, the decision to withdraw a lawsuit against a group of payday lenders that allegedly misled consumers about the cost of loans, which had interest rates as high as 950 percent a year, and the decision to cease an investigation into World Acceptance Corporation, a high-cost installment lender which was reportedly engaging in abusive practices. And, in fact, the former CEO of World Acceptance Corporation felt so comfortable with Mr. Mulvaney, that she had the audacity to send to him a letter requesting that she be appointed

to run the whole agency as the director.

So many of us were shocked at the audacity that she exhibited, and tried to find out from Mr. Mulvaney today, I did in particular, why did he halt the lawsuit against her company and why would she send him her resume to ask to be considered for the role of director of the Consumer Bureau.

Mr. Mulvaney’s many harmful actions send a signal to bad actors that they can get away with abusing consumers.

What is more, Republicans have relentlessly attacked the Consumer Bureau since its inception. Despite what my Republican colleagues may have you believe, the leadership structure of the Consumer Bureau is not unique. In fact, there are other Federal regulatory agencies with similar structures, but these facts haven’t stopped Republicans and some in the industry from making legal challenges to its structure. That is why last year, I led 40 other current and former Members of Congress to file a brief with the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the P.H.H. case support of the Consumer Bureau’s independent structure and its clear constitutionality. And earlier this year, the court issued a decision upholding the constitutionality of the Consumer Bureau’s structure.

Republicans have been clamoring to weaken, impede, and ultimately destroy the Consumer Bureau since its creation. First, they did everything they could to block a director from being appointed in the first place, and since then, they have pushed measures to defund and dismantle the Consumer Bureau. The chairman has called for the Consumer Bureau to be “functionally terminated,” and advanced legislation, including H.R. 10, which I call the “Wrong” CHOICE Act, to do so.

Now, in Mick Mulvaney, Republicans have an ally to destroy the Consumer Bureau from within, but it is unclear why destroying the Consumer Bureau is at the top of the Republican agenda.

There are constituents in every State who have been ripped off by financial institutions. Why aren’t Republicans fighting for them and for their financial security?

Mr. Speaker, Democrats will not allow the Consumer Bureau to be diverted from its statutorily mandated mission of protecting consumers and serving as an independent watchdog.

This agency is crucial for hard-working Americans, and its work must continue.

Mr. Speaker, in my closing, I would like to thank Congresswoman MALONEY for the way that she conducted her questions today with Mr. Mulvaney in our committee and asked him how many cases had he taken up, what had he initiated against those companies that are committing fraud, only to find out that he has done nothing. She forced him to answer, and he had to admit, zero, that he has not taken any actions against any companies in this

country who are involved in the kind of actions that the Consumer Bureau is designed to deal with and to force them to do the right thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, in that, I would like to thank Congresswoman MALONEY for initiating this action this evening that we are taking to make sure everyone understands the importance of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and I appreciate working with her to get this done.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for her statement tonight and for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN), and we welcome him.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MALONEY and Ranking Member WATERS for providing me this opportunity to speak about the critical importance of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB.

Mr. Speaker, during the recession, Nevada was ground zero for the housing crisis.

For 5 years, Nevada led the Nation in foreclosures. In 2010, 70 percent of Nevada homeowners were underwater on their homes. I saw firsthand as family, friends, neighbors, and constituents who lost their homes because of big banks and unscrupulous mortgage lenders.

While Nevada has made a tremendous recovery since the recession, the scars are deep and still fresh.

In the wake of the financial crisis, the CFPB was created to protect Americans from unfair, deceptive, or abusive practices that led to the financial crisis, and to take action against companies that break the law.

The CFPB has cracked down on predatory lenders and aggressive debt collectors, and forced financial institutions to return over \$11 billion to Americans who have been taken advantage of.

Since 2011, the agency has been a resource for thousands of my constituents. More than 14,000 Nevadans have gone to the CFPB with complaints, and over 3,400 of them about mortgages.

It is appalling that Mr. Mulvaney and congressional Republicans are focused on destroying the CFPB at the expense of American families.

When someone has an unwarranted overdraft, an incorrect credit score, or is misled by their bank, they turn to the CFPB for help.

I will do everything I can to ensure that Nevadans never again have to experience the pain of being foreclosed on or being preyed upon by unscrupulous lenders.

The cost to consumers is not only their livelihoods, but the future of our economy, because a strong economy includes a strong consumer.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his really heartfelt report to us on how it affected his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article in Roll Call on the importance of the CFPB, and also the actions that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has taken by the numbers to help people in our country.

MULVANEY'S ATTACKS ON CFPB HURT CONSUMERS AND ECONOMY

(By Rep. Carolyn Maloney)

As a congressman, Mick Mulvaney once co-sponsored a bill to abolish the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. And since being appointed by President Donald Trump to temporarily lead the agency, he has worked to cripple it from the inside.

What he is doing will hurt consumers not once but twice—first, by letting off the hook financial institutions that take advantage of their customers, and second, by giving other companies large incentives to do the same.

In its first six years, the CFPB has handled more than 1.2 million complaints and delivered almost \$12 billion in relief to nearly 30 million consumers. It has put in place new protections against payday lending, investigated predatory payday lenders, fought mortgage servicers for wrongful foreclosures, established new mortgage standards to protect homebuyers, and required lenders to verify that borrowers have the means to repay their loans. It also banned financial institutions from using arbitration clauses to deny consumers the right to sue, took action against companies for illegal collection of student loan debt, ordered Wells Fargo to pay full restitution to customers for opening accounts without their consent, enforced the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights, published a public database of consumer complaints, and established extensive educational materials on financial products for consumers.

Sen. Elizabeth Warren, D-Mass., who was the driving force behind the CFPB's creation, has pointed out that we shouldn't put people in charge of agencies they want to destroy. That seems self-evident—unless the specific goal is to destroy it.

Soon after his appointment, Mulvaney began weakening and radically changing the CFPB, stating that part of the agency's new core mission statement would be to deregulate financial products by "regularly identifying and addressing outdated, unnecessary or unduly burdensome regulations."

He has zealously pursued this new mission by putting a freeze on the implementation of all new rules, delaying long-planned rules to protect users of prepaid cards, halting the agency's investigation of Equifax for failing to protect customers' private information, weakening rules against predatory payday lenders, and pulling the plug on a suit against payday lenders that charged annualized interest rates of up to 950 percent. Mulvaney is trying to politicize the agency by placing political appointees in positions normally staffed by nonpartisan civil servants. He also tried to starve the agency by requesting zero operating funds for the second quarter of fiscal 2018.

The rollbacks won't just hurt consumers, they will also hurt our economy. Fair regulations that protect consumers are essential for well-functioning markets. Without effective rules, we've seen that some companies will cheat their customers. As word spreads, millions of consumers are forced to question whether products are safe or secure. This uncertainty leads them to buy less. Many businesses—even those that treat their customers fairly—lose sales. The economy suffers.

One would think that deregulators like Mulvaney would have learned a lesson from the 2007–2008 financial meltdown, which threw our economy into a devastating recession.

At the root of the crisis were the many lenders who convinced American consumers to purchase mortgages they could not afford, including the infamous NINJA loans to those with "no income, no job and no assets." At first, companies that sold these predatory loans were on the outskirts of the industry, but when regulators failed to step in to protect consumers, many reputable companies that feared being left off the gravy train jumped in.

The mountain of subprime mortgages, sold and repackaged as securities presumably to eliminate risk, turned out to be a house of cards, resulting in what former Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke called "the worst financial crisis in global history, including the Great Depression." Millions of Americans lost their jobs or their homes. It took nine years for the economy to fully recover.

Fair regulations that are enforced rigorously are critical not only to protect consumers, but because they are essential for markets to work efficiently. Deliberate efforts to undermine the CFPB will not only prove to be a raw deal for millions of Americans but can cause lasting damage to our economy.

**CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU:
BY THE NUMBERS**

\$11.9 billion: Approximate amount of ordered relief to consumers from CFPB supervisory and enforcement work, including:

Approximately \$3.8 billion in monetary compensation ordered to be returned to consumers as a result of enforcement activity

Approximately \$7.7 billion in principal reductions, cancelled debts, and other consumer relief ordered as a result of enforcement activity

\$398 million in consumer relief as a result of supervisory activity

29 million: Consumers who will receive relief as a result of CFPB supervisory and enforcement work

\$600 million+: Money collected in civil monetary penalties as a result of CFPB enforcement work

1,242,800+: Complaints CFPB has handled as of July 1, 2017

13 million: Unique visitors to Ask CFPB

10.5 million: Mortgages consumers closed on after consumers received the CFPB's Know Before You Owe disclosures

147: Banks and credit unions under the CFPB's supervisory authority as of April 1, 2017

12 million: Consumers who are takeout payday loans each year; the CFPB has proposed rules to put an end to payday debt traps

70 million: Consumers who are contacted about debts in collection during the year; the CFPB is developing proposed rules to protect consumers from harmful collection practices

3,270+: Colleges voluntarily adopting the CFPB and Dept. of Ed Financial Aid Shopping Sheet

169: Visits to military installations by the Office of Servicemember Affairs since 2011

63: Times senior CFPB officials have testified before Congress

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the hardworking people at the CFPB and those who worked to create it, and I thank my colleagues and friends for joining me tonight on this Special Order.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3445. An act to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3979. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer services, community partnership, and refuge education programs of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 12, 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:

4440. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing 15 officers to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4441. A letter from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's FY 2017 EEO Program Status Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4442. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2018-N-0011] received April 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4443. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act; Implementation [Docket No.: NIH-2016-0001] (RIN: 0925-AA63) received April 3, 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.

4444. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 74, 76 and 78 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Maintenance of Copies of FCC Rules [MB Docket No.: 17-231]; Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative [MB Docket No.: 17-105] received March 28, 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.

4445. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-04, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4446. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-71, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4447. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-72, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4448. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-65, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4449. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-10, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4450. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2017 Multinational Force and Observers Annual Report, pursuant to Sec. 6 of Public Law 97-132 for the period January 16, 2017, to January 15, 2018; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4451. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report pursuant to Sec. 2(8) of the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Treaty with Australia Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation (Treaty Doc. 110-10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4452. A letter from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's FY 2017 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4453. A letter from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunity and Inclusion, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's FY 2017 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4454. A letter from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunity and Inclusion, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2017 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4455. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2017 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4456. A letter from the Senior Director, Government Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting Amtrak's audited Consolidated Financial Statements

for the years ended September 30, 2017 and 2016; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4457. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's FY 2017 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4458. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the "Fifth Biennial Report to Congress: Estimates of Natural Gas and Oil Reserves, Reserves Growth, and Undiscovered Resources in Federal and State Waters off the Coasts of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama — 2017 Update", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 16295(c); Public Law 109-58, Sec. 965(c); (119 Stat. 893); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4459. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation (RIN: 1601-AA80) received April 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4460. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled "Report on Denials of Visas to Confiscators of American Property", pursuant to Sec. 2225(c) of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998, as contained in the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act 1999, Public Law 105-277, 8 U.S.C. 1182d; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4461. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GA 8 Airvan (Pty) Ltd Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1166; Product Identifier 2017-CE-042-AD; Amendment 39-19217; AD 2018-05-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4462. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0020; Product Identifier 2016-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-19209; AD 2018-04-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4463. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1184; Product Identifier 2017-CE-029-AD; Amendment 39-19205; AD 2018-04-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4464. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9435; Product Identifier 2016-NM-108-AD; Amendment 39-18830; AD 2017-06-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4465. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0909; Product Identifier 2017-NM-081-AD; Amendment 39-19214; AD 2018-05-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4466. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9074; Product Identifier 2016-NM-097-AD; Amendment 39-19213; AD 2018-05-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4467. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9519; Product Identifier 2016-NM-099-AD; Amendment 39-19200; AD 2018-04-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4468. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0713; Product Identifier 2016-NM-199-AD; Amendment 39-19170; AD 2018-02-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4469. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0806; Product Identifier 2017-NM-064-AD; Amendment 39-19216; AD 2018-05-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4470. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0527; Product Identifier 2017-NM-015-AD; Amendment 39-19215; AD 2018-05-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4471. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0766; Product Identifier 2017-NM-046-AD; Amendment 39-19203; AD 2018-04-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 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.

4472. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums

and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31180; Amdt. No.: 3788] received March 26, 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.

4473. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Selinsgrove, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0839; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AEA-7] received March 26, 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.

4474. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenville, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0801; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-17] received March 26, 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.

4475. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the 56th Annual Report covering activities of the Commission for FY 2017, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 306(a); Public Law 109-304, Sec. 4; (120 Stat. 1489); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4476. A letter from the Vice President, Government Relations, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Authority's Statistical Summary for FY 2017; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4477. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Requirements for Submissions Requesting Exclusions from the Remedies Instituted in Presidential Proclamations Adjusting Imports of Steel into the United States and Adjusting Imports of Aluminum into the United States; and the filing of Objections to Submitted Exclusion Requests for Steel and Aluminum [Docket No.: 180227217-8217-01] (RIN: 0694-AH55) received March 27, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4478. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Allocation of Controlled Group Research Credit [TD 9832] (RIN: 1545-BL76) received March 29, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4479. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Transitional Guidance Under Sec. 162(f) and 6050X with Respect to Certain Fines, Penalties, and Other Amounts [Notice 2018-23] received March 29, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4480. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Initial Guidance Under Section 163(j) as Applicable to Taxable Years Beginning After December 31, 2017 [Notice 2018-28] received April 3, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4481. A letter from the Regulations Writer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmit-

ting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Expiration Dates for Two Body System Listings [Docket No.: SSA-2018-0007] (RIN: 0960-AI18) received April 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 401. A bill to designate the mountain at the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming, as Devils Tower, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-630). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 520. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to the economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4895. A bill to establish the Medgar Evers National Monument in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 5466. A bill to exempt Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid from any Federal balanced budget requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr.

JONES, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOST, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SOTO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 5467. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend certain morale, welfare, and recreation privileges to certain veterans and their caregivers, to authorize the appropriation of funds for the purpose of improving the electronic physical access con-

trol system used by military commissaries and exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 5468. A bill to amend chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for certain limitations on judicial review of agency actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5469. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require Members of Congress to disclose business ties with foreign entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 5470. A bill to repeal the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 5471. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Gateway Communities Improvement Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 5472. A bill to promote competition and help consumers save money by giving them the freedom to choose where they buy prescription pet medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 5473. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to update or issue one or more guidances addressing alternative methods for data collection on opioid sparing and inclusion of such data in product labeling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr.

GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SERRANO, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. SOTO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 5474. A bill to make available necessary disaster assistance for families affected by major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for him-

self, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 5475. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 108 North Macon Street in Bevier, Missouri, as the "SO2 Navy SEAL Adam Olin Smith Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5476. A bill to ensure independent investigations and judicial review of the removal of a special counsel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 5477. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a demonstration project to increase substance use

provider capacity under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 5478. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to make funds available for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands pilot project for fiscal years 2019 through 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5479. A bill to direct the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service to establish a special unit within the office of Stakeholder Partnership, Education and Communication to provide members of the uniformed services with tax assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H. Res. 814. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H. Res. 815. A resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the foundation of the State of Israel and the opening of the United States Embassy in Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 816. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself,

Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SIREN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H. Res. 817. A resolution promoting and supporting the goals and ideals of the Fair Housing Act and recognizing April 2018 as Fair Housing Month, which includes bringing attention to the discrimination faced by every-day Americans in the United States in housing and housing-related transactions on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, familial status, disability, and religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT

of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. ROY-BAL-ALLARD, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCEachin, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mrs. TORRES):

H. Res. 818. A resolution recognizing “Black Maternal Health Week” to bring national attention to the maternal health care crisis in the Black community and the importance of reducing the rate of maternal mortality and morbidity among Black women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 819. A resolution recognizing the 110th anniversary of the American Association for Cancer Research, the world’s first and largest professional organization dedicated to the conquest of cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LEE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. MOORE):

H. Res. 820. A resolution recognizing the life and significant contributions of Winnie Madikizela-Mandela, the former wife of Nelson Mandela, and an icon in the international fight against apartheid and injustice in South Africa, for her leadership and her devotion to the cause of freedom for all South Africans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H. Res. 821. A resolution recognizing the importance of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, its replica which travels in “The Wall That Heals” exhibit, and the distinguished servicemembers the memorials honor and commemorate; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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.

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. DEUTCH:

H.R. 5466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution: 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; but all Duties,

Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 5468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause “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;” and Article III, Section 1, Clause 1, Sentence 1, Section 2, Clause 1, and Section 2, Clause 2, Sentence 2, of the Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects judicial powers and cases that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 5470.

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, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1, Article 8

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 5472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 5473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 5474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or
Article One of the United States Constitution, 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;

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 5475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7

“The Congress shall have power to . . . establish Post Offices and Post Roads . . .”

In the Constitution, the power possessed by Congress embraces the regulation of the Postal System in the country. Therefore, the proposed legislation in naming a post office would fall under the powers granted to Congress in the Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 5476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 9 and 18

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 5477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 5478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 5479.

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.”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 172: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 173: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 233: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 427: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 592: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 644: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 681: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PERRY, and Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 756: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 778: Mr. FASO.
H.R. 788: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 846: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 881: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 942: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SOTO, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 959: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. KIHUEN.
H.R. 967: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 982: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 1057: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1120: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1150: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1206: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1316: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 1318: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 1409: Mr. UPTON, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. KEATING, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1445: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1542: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1606: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1734: Mr. POSEY and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1928: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.
H.R. 1939: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 1953: Mr. HURD.
H.R. 1957: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2015: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2069: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2070: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2077: Ms. DELAULO and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2293: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2358: Mr. HURD, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2392: Mr. POCAN and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2439: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2525: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2553: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 2556: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2584: Mr. MAST and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2620: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 2856: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 2899: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3207: Mr. POLIS, Mr. SIRES, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3260: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3303: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3314: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 3324: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 3429: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3574: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3605: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 3617: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 3645: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3654: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3666: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 3692: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3767: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3790: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 3859: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3866: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 3871: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3931: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 4006: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 4022: Mr. WELCH, Ms. MENG, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HURD, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4097: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 4099: Mr. BOST, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4116: Ms. NORTON and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 4117: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4243: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 4256: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4265: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 4314: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 4426: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 4445: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4472: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 4473: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 4575: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4638: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4647: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4653: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 4673: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 4681: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4691: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 4693: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 4732: Mr. EMMER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. REED, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 4747: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4775: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4841: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4846: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4881: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 4903: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 4915: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 4980: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5002: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5003: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. ROSS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 5016: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 5034: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BERA, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 5052: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 5083: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 5090: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 5105: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 5108: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 5137: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 5171: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 5176: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 5188: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 5191: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 5192: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 5216: Ms. TITUS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5226: Mr. SIRES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 5241: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5248: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 5258: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 5281: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 5294: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 5306: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. SCHKOWSKY.
H.R. 5311: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. SHEAPORTER.
H.R. 5314: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 5327: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 5329: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 5336: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 5348: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5356: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5358: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 5417: Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 5428: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5452: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5464: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. GARRETT.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. KEATING.
H.J. Res. 107: Mr. SUOZZI and Ms. ROSEN.
H.J. Res. 119: Mr. ZELDIN.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H. Res. 199: Ms. TITUS and Mr. BUDD.
H. Res. 576: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H. Res. 763: Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. BACON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr.

April 11, 2018

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H3149

GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. H. Res. 800: Ms. SINEMA.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 2018

No. 58

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Spirit of the living God, fall afresh on us today. You are a God of might and power, and our times are in Your hands. Forgive us for sometimes forgetting to trust Your prevailing providence, as You increase our faith through the power of Your Holy Word.

Lord, thank You for our lawmakers. Remind them that they are appointed by You and are, therefore, accountable to You for their work. May they not forget that they are servants of Your Kingdom as You motivate them to be faithful in what they think, say, and do. Provide them with Your wisdom, empowering them to fulfill Your purposes for their lives.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

SPEAKER RYAN'S RETIREMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning, Speaker RYAN announced to his colleagues that he will be departing the House at the conclusion of the 115th Congress.

Two and a half years ago, PAUL RYAN was drafted by his colleagues to lead

the House through a new era. Like a true leader, PAUL stepped up to the plate. He answered his colleagues' call with exactly the earnest, selfless, and focused approach that has defined his entire career in Congress. The results have been beyond impressive.

Capping off a remarkable 20-year career in Congress, PAUL's speakership has yielded one significant accomplishment after another for his conference, his constituents in Wisconsin's First Congressional District, as well as the American people.

True to his career-long reputation as a champion for pro-growth economics, PAUL helped lead the way on last year's once-in-a-generation rewrite of the Nation's Tax Code. Thanks in large part to his personal passion and expertise, reform became a reality, and our economy is charting a new course toward greater prosperity and greater opportunity.

On its own, this generational accomplishment would secure the Speaker's legacy as a transformational conservative leader, but, of course, it is far from the only fruit of his speakership. His leadership was vital to securing everything from the largest year-on-year increase in defense funding in 15 years to the remaking of the way we treat and find cures for rare diseases. What is more, PAUL has paired that ambitious agenda with infectious good cheer and an unflagging commitment to serve all Americans. Amidst all the stresses and pressures of leadership, PAUL's optimism and energy never waned.

It has been a sincere pleasure and a real inspiration to work alongside this humble servant and happy warrior. I am glad we can count on his continued leadership through the rest of this year because our work together is far from finished. I look forward to collaborating closely these next months to implement more of the inclusive, pro-growth, pro-opportunity agenda the American people are counting on us to keep advancing.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now on another matter, yesterday the Senate confirmed the first of six nominees slated for consideration this week, Claria Horn Boom to serve as district judge for the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky. She was confirmed 96 to 1. There was just one Senator in opposition.

This is the kind of uncontroversial nomination the Senate could typically dispatch by a voice vote, but not these days. Over and over again, we have had to file cloture and exhaust floor time on amply qualified nominees who then soar through their confirmation votes by lopsided margins.

Since President Trump took office, the Senate has had to hold 82—82—cloture votes on judicial and executive nominations. In the first 2 years of President Obama's administration, there were only 12 such cloture votes—12 for President Obama, 4 for George W. Bush, 8 for President Clinton, and already, just a few months into President Trump's second year, there have been 82. The numbers speak for themselves.

Today we will have the opportunity to confirm yet another qualified nominee for a critical post. John Ring's nomination to serve on the National Labor Relations Board is an important next step to continue cleaning years of regulatory rust off of the American economy. It is a natural addition to the progress we have made scaling back unhelpful regulations that make it harder for American businesses to create jobs and make opportunities for American workers more scarce.

Mr. Ring's confirmation will give the country a fully staffed NLRB once again and turn the page on the previous administration's efforts to remake this bipartisan Board into a one-sided political weapon. Even in a short amount of time last year, we saw just how much good a fully functioning NLRB can do for American workers when it calls balls and strikes fairly instead of bending over backward to

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2047

meet Big Labor's every demand. Today we will have the chance to get things back to normal for the long term.

Mr. Ring has a distinguished record in labor negotiation. I would urge my colleagues to join me in voting to confirm him today.

After Mr. Ring, the Senate will turn to the nomination of Pat Pizzella to serve as Deputy Secretary of Labor. The fact that this Cabinet agency has gone 15 months without its No. 2 official is yet another testament to the historic obstruction visited on this administration by Senate Democrats. He has been sitting on the calendar for 6 months despite his ample qualifications. I would urge all of my colleagues to vote to finally advance Mr. Pizzella's nomination.

TAX REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, this week we have been discussing the stark difference between the Obama administration's agenda and the policies that President Trump and this Republican Congress have implemented.

During the Obama years, the overwhelming majority of all the limited new growth and new jobs went to the biggest and richest urban areas. Times were good if you happened to live in New York, San Francisco, or a few other places, but if you were one of the millions of Americans in our Nation's towns, smaller cities, suburbs, or rural areas, they were not so good. According to one estimate, between 2010 and 2016, 73 percent of all the employment gains in the country went to metro areas with more than 1 million residents. Practically everywhere else, Americans either treaded water or started sinking.

This President and this Republican Congress were sent here to put this right, and because the American people gave us a chance to do so, they now have leaders in Washington who focus on cutting taxes instead of raising them, rolling back overregulation instead of piling on more suffocating rules, and looking out for the best interests of all workers and job creators, not just those in our biggest and wealthiest cities.

The early results from our inclusive opportunity agenda are clear. After years of stagnation, we are beginning to see signs that rural America turned a corner in 2017. One analysis found that last year, rural areas outpaced the rest of the country in job creation, relative to the share of the economy they started out with. There is still much, much more to do, but these early promising signs add up to hundreds of thousands of new jobs. That is a sight for sore eyes in Kentucky, West Virginia, Montana, Maine, and so many other States.

What about our smaller cities? I recently heard from my friend Senator TOOMEY that, because of this historic tax reform we passed last year, Car-

penter Technology in Reading, PA, will invest \$100 million in expanded manufacturing capabilities—\$100 million in our economy and American workers because of tax reform. For this American manufacturer, founded in 1889, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act means a new hot rolling mill to produce the special alloys for aerospace and consumer electronics. They are also investing in 3D printing. This is what happens when manufacturers have the breathing room to bet on the U.S. economy and on their American workforce. Breathing room is exactly what our policy is giving them. Carpenter already employs more than 3,000 Pennsylvanians, and with this kind of major capital investment, I expect they will be competing for future generations of skilled workers as well.

Pennsylvania should be proud of Senator TOOMEY. He is one of the leaders who have helped lead the charge for tax reform. It is a shame his colleague, the senior Senator for Pennsylvania, put party politics ahead of workers and taxpayers and voted to block tax reform right from the beginning.

Fortunately, my Democratic colleagues failed to block tax reform from taking place, even though many now want to repeal the law that has led to new jobs, higher wages, and increased opportunities all across our country.

Stories like these are just the first fruits of tax reform, regulatory reform, and all the other ways this Republican Congress is fighting for every American worker, job creator, and middle-class family.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Before I get to the substance of my remarks, I remind my dear friend the majority leader that the vast majority of the benefits of this tax break, this tax cut, went to the wealthiest of Americans and large corporations. What are they doing with the money? They are using most of it for buybacks. That was a buyback. They buy back their own stock. The CEO—already a rich guy—is making more money. The shareholders, one-third of whom are out of the country and most of whom are in the top 10 percent of America, make more money. The middle class and rural America particularly are left behind in this bill.

We could have done a tax bill where the benefits went to the middle class—not just some—10, 20 percent—but all. So this bill is a bit of a fake. There are small benefits for the middle class, along with harm to their healthcare. The things put in this bill are going to raise many people's premiums far more than their small tax break.

Let's be honest about this. This bill was done for the rich and the wealthy in power, and there were some benefits to the middle class, but it could have been so much better. Our Republican colleagues listened to the wealthy special interests, the large contributors, and that is how this bill came about.

By the way, because it creates a deficit of \$1.5 trillion—and I remind our leader that rural America really cares about deficits—there are a lot of Republicans, particularly the more conservative ones, who say: Now let's cut Medicare and Social Security. How is an elderly person in rural America going to feel about that?

I would simply say that this bill was not the right remedy for America, which is owed a lot better.

SPEAKER RYAN'S RETIREMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Speaker RYAN. I know Speaker RYAN quite well. He is a good man. He is always true to his word. Even though we disagree on most issues, in the areas where we can work together, I find him to be smart, thoughtful, and straightforward. I find him to have a great deal of integrity. We don't agree, but he has deep beliefs, and he is not like some on his side of the aisle who say: It is my way or no way. He is willing to meet you to try to get something done.

So I have thoroughly enjoyed working with Speaker RYAN. I admire him as a human being, as a religious man, and somebody who cares a lot about his family. I understand his frustrations; I do. When you have so many intransigent people in your caucus who say "it is my way or no way," and your job, even though you have deep beliefs, is to want to get something done, it is hard. It is hard.

Now, with his newfound political freedom, I hope the Speaker uses his remaining time in Congress to break free from these hard-right factions that have plagued him so and that have kept Congress from getting real things done. If he is willing to reach across the aisle, he will find Democrats willing and eager to work with him.

I say to Speaker RYAN: Let's work together. You are more of a free man now. Follow your instincts. Your beliefs will not be the same as ours, but you will want to try to come to some kind of an agreement where we can meet somewhere in the middle.

The job may be made harder because Congressmen SCALISE and MCCARTHY are now competing for Ryan's job and the hard right's favor—they are too vital in that caucus—but I believe Speaker RYAN is up to the job and can overcome that problem and work in his last few months here for the betterment of our country.

AVOIDING A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, on the issues of yesterday and last

night, for months, I have heard my Republican colleagues argue that there is no need to pass legislation to protect Special Counsel Mueller and the Russian probe from President Trump because they have been assured by anonymous White House officials that it will not happen.

President Trump, in his own words on Monday night, made it plain as day that he may be considering firing the special counsel and/or the Deputy Attorney General, which would be equally egregious. The White House spokeswoman, from the podium, said President Trump believes he has the authority to fire the special counsel all by himself, and a report in the New York Times said President Trump considered firing Mueller as recently as December, in addition to a year ago in June.

Only an hour ago, the President tweeted that the “Fake & Corrupt Russia Investigation”—his words—was “headed up by all the Democrat loyalists, or people that worked for Obama.”

Mr. President, will you start telling the truth? Robert Mueller is a Republican. Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein is a Republican whom you appointed. Christopher Wray, the head of the FBI, is a Republican whom you appointed.

I don't know how long the President can believe people will swallow the bold mistruths he spews out day after day after day, but what he said—that the people the investigation was being headed up by are all Democratic loyalists or people who work for Obama—is patently false, and the President should retract it.

These kinds of remarks make it all too obvious that the President, who cares so little for truth, may be considering the firing of the special counsel or the Deputy Attorney General. So I would like to direct my remarks to my Republican colleagues. I say to my Republican colleagues, you can no longer rely on anonymous sources as a reason for delay or inaction on legislation to protect Mr. Mueller and avoid a constitutional crisis. The evidence is staring us all in the face. We cannot ignore the elephant in the room any longer because the consequences of the President taking action against Mueller or Rosenstein or issuing political pardons is just too dire. As Democrats have said, and as many Republicans have said, such action would precipitate a constitutional crisis in this country. The President doesn't seem to realize it, but I know my Republican colleagues do.

No person is above the law in this country—not even the President. He is not a King. He is the President. If the President were to interfere in any way with the chain of command in the Russia investigation or clean house at the Justice Department in order to install lackeys who will carry out his orders, we would be no better than a banana republic. The kinds of things we see happening in other parts of the globe would be happening here. In those

places, leaders use the levers of power to subvert or avoid accountability in all ways. President Trump seems to wish he could do just that.

I want to be crystal clear on this point. If the President were to take action against Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein, it would be every bit as grave of a mistake as removing Special Counsel Mueller. America, as we know it—as we love it—would diminish. I know Republicans and Democrats agree on that.

So why not take the bull by the horns? Why wouldn't we take immediate action to potentially prevent a constitutional crisis from coming to pass? Why don't we head it off at the pass and move bipartisan legislation that has been introduced this morning, through the Judiciary Committee—which I am told Senator GRASSLEY is seriously considering—on to the floor of the Senate, where I hope Leader MCCONNELL will place it. A bipartisan group this morning—Senators GRAHAM and TILLIS, BOOKER and COONS—have introduced legislation that would help protect the special counsel. Why not pass this legislation now and avoid a constitutional crisis? Why not avoid an injury to the body of this great country and then try to stitch it up? Why not avoid an injury instead of sustaining it and trying to stitch it up? That is what we should be doing.

Let's not wait until it is too late. Let's head the constitutional crisis off at the pass by passing the bipartisan legislation introduced by Senators GRAHAM, TILLIS, BOOKER, and COONS and take the threat of a crisis off the table right now.

So I urge Senator GRASSLEY to schedule a hearing and markup on this bill and to report it out of his committee. He must be sure not to water it down with amendments or accept changes that would render it useless. I urge Leader MCCONNELL to then take that bill and put it on the floor where we can debate and pass it. Surely, something this serious deserves the time and attention of U.S. Senators. I dare say, if bipartisan legislation like this came to the floor, it would pass by a large majority—Members of both parties—and the pressure on the House to do the same would be large.

The rule of law cannot be a partisan issue and should not be a partisan issue. We cannot let it become a partisan issue. The Congress must clearly, loudly, and with one voice pass legislation to ensure that any effort by the President to remove Special Counsel Mueller or Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein would be rendered unsuccessful.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2022.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

THE OLD GUARD

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, last Friday marked the 70th anniversary of the 3rd Infantry Regiment's reactivation, and as one of its veterans, I didn't want to let the moment pass without notice.

The 3rd Infantry Regiment, more commonly known as the Old Guard, serves across the Potomac River at Arlington National Cemetery. Most here and most in the Gallery have probably visited the cemetery and seen Old Guard soldiers guarding the Tomb of the Unknowns or conducting funerals. Arkansans who visit me here in the Capitol consistently tell me that Arlington is a highlight of their trip. That is not surprising to me, because Old Guard soldiers set the standard for their dedication, their diligence, and their devotion. The 3rd Infantry is the Nation's oldest Active-Duty infantry unit, and yet the reverence we feel for them goes beyond their mere length of service and to what they represent: the dignity of freedom.

On April 6, 1948, the 3rd Infantry was reactivated on orders of the Secretary of the Army. The ceremony was held just a few steps from here, on the East Plaza of the Capitol. Then, the Old Guard immediately conducted another ceremony to present the Flag of Liberation to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. That flag had flown over this very Capitol on Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1941. Then, those forces raised that flag over Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo after we had defeated the Axis powers. Finally, the Old Guard led the large Army Day parade from the Capitol down Constitution Avenue, where

President Truman sat in the reviewing stand at the Ellipse.

That is not bad for their first day back with the regimental colors. It had been only 18 months since the regiment, serving with the 106th Division as an occupation force in Berlin, was caught up in the rushed demobilizations at the end of World War II. But the Army needed an official ceremonial unit in the Nation's Capital, as well as the contingency force as tension built up between the United States and the Soviet Union. So the Army called the 3rd Infantry back into service at Fort Myer, right next to Arlington, and restored "the history formerly belonging" to the legendary regiment. That was due, in no small part, to the regiment's reputation for professionalism, present from its very beginning.

The 3rd Infantry was stood up in 1784, when the Continental Congress created the "First American Regiment." The War for Independence had convinced Congress that, whatever its fear of standing armies, the country needed at least a small professional fighting force to defend it. So the 3rd Infantry started as the lone professional regiment in the early days of our Republic, when our common defense was organized mostly around State militias. To this day, its members continue to display that professionalism by holding themselves to the most exacting standards as the Army's highest profile unit and the official escort to the President.

But the 3rd Infantry's professionalism also had a serious purpose: to defend America. So faithfully has the regiment served the American people that its history and the Nation's history are thoroughly intertwined.

First, it served at posts along the frontier, where it protected American settlements against Indian attacks under the leadership of General "Mad" Anthony Wayne, and it fought the British Imperial Army to a standstill during the War of 1812. Today, members of the regiment wear a buff strap on their left shoulders to commemorate that 18th century heritage.

After the war, peacetime demobilization and reorganization gave the regiment its current name, the 3rd Infantry. Then, during the Mexican War, the 3rd Infantry distinguished itself with bravery, skill, and stamina at every major battle of the war, in places like Palo Alto, Monterrey, and Vera Cruz. Its famed bayonet charge at the Battle of Cerro Gordo is what persuaded the War Department in 1922 to authorize the 3rd Infantry to march with bayonets fixed to their rifles—a privilege still reserved solely to that regiment in the entire U.S. Army. It was because of the 3rd Infantry's valor that General Winfield Scott, the commanding general of the Vera Cruz campaign, granted it the honor of leading the victorious march into Mexico City, during which he turned to his staff as the 3rd Infantry passed in review, and said: "Gentlemen, take off your hats to the Old Guard of the Army." Ever since, the name has stuck.

After the Mexican War came the Civil War, which divided not only our Nation but also our Army. Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee, who both fought alongside the Old Guard in Mexico, now faced off against each other. The 3rd Infantry fought every major battle in the war's first 2 years: First Bull Run, Second Bull Run, the Seven Days Battles, Antietam, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, and, finally, Gettysburg. Suffering casualties that exceeded its original strength, the Old Guard ended the war at the Union's mobile headquarters, standing alongside General Grant at the Appomattox courthouse as he accepted General Lee's surrender.

In the days that followed, the vast majority of State volunteers returned home to their families—not the Old Guard. The "regulars," as they were known back then, went straight back to the front, again protecting settlers from Indian raids across the western frontier. They defeated Spanish forces in Cuba during the Spanish-American War. They fought rebel insurgents in the Philippines and then returned to fight Muslim insurgents there, too, in some of the same places where the Islamic State is present today.

They guarded our border with Mexico during World War I. They helped to get the lend-lease program going in the early days of World War II, before deploying to Europe itself. But it was after the Old Guard's reactivation that it assumed the duties for which it is rightly famous today: performing ceremonies and military honor funerals.

For its first 162 years, the Old Guard defended America's frontiers and fought its wars, both at home and abroad. Now these new responsibilities have defined the Old Guard's mission for the last 70 years. The size and structure of the regiment has evolved, just as Arlington National Cemetery itself has grown. The Old Guard's prominence has increased, as it has participated in major internationally televised events, such as the ceremony to inter the unknown soldiers from World War II and the Korean war in 1958 and the state funeral for President Kennedy in 1963. But the essence of the mission has not changed since 1948.

It is this history, this reliability, this steady, sober leadership that the Old Guard has become known for. Their skill and proficiency, their care and attention to detail, their faithfulness and discipline—all of them—set the highest of standards of military conduct and character. Our fellow Americans see all that whenever they visit Arlington. They can imagine it on the battlefield. Then, they have little wonder why our soldiers accomplish such amazing feats of valor. That is why the Old Guard is held in such reverence, and that is why it is fitting to mark this important anniversary.

The Old Guard represents the best of our country, but also the best in ourselves. Freedom isn't free. It requires self-sacrifice and self-discipline. That

is what makes it a noble and, therefore, a fulfilling way of life. For reminding us of that dignity—the dignity that comes with being a free people—the men and women of the Old Guard deserve our deepest thanks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without object, it is so ordered.

VENEZUELA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week, I spent 4 days in Venezuela. I had never been there before. I was given an opportunity to get a visa to go to the country, and I jumped at the opportunity. Venezuela, of course, on the north end of the South American continent, is a constant source of concern in the United States and the region, and I wanted to see for myself what was happening. No doubt, many are aware that Venezuela has been suffering devastating economic and democratic backsliding, but what I found was a country that is on the edge of collapse, facing overlapping economic, humanitarian, and political crises.

On the economic side, Venezuela has so many positive things. It is rich in natural beauty, oil, minerals, and human talent, but it has seen its economy run into the ground by mindless price controls, multiple exchange rates, and gross mismanagement. Inflation is rampant and expected to reach 13,000 percent this year, leading to what some call "a race for survival."

Imagine walking down the main street of Caracas and seeing long lines at every ATM. Why are they there? Because each day, the residents of Venezuela must go to the ATM machine with their credit card or debit card and take out the maximum withdrawal allowed. It is hundreds of thousands of Bolivars, which sound like more money than you could possibly need, but it translates into 20 cents—waiting an hour at an ATM machine for 20 cents' worth of currency so that you can ride the bus back and forth to work. That is what life is like in the capital of Venezuela.

They have universally discredited and arbitrary price controls that are eerily reminiscent of the failed policies in Cuba and the Soviet Union. They have decimated local production and left basic goods unavailable or unaffordable.

I went down the main street in Caracas and saw many shops but no customers. Basic goods were available—shampoo or diapers, for example—but they cost the equivalent of 2 or 3 months of salary. We stopped and did a translation at one store that isn't under price controls, and we found that a pound of hamburger costs \$4, which doesn't sound bad, except that that is the minimum monthly wage in Venezuela—for a pound of hamburger. People waited in long lines.

Rampant inflation—hyperinflation, really—has made actual cash scarce, and near worthless when it can actually be found. I have never visited a country where I never touched their currency. They warned me against it. They said: If you buy things here, as a tourist, you are going to pay 20 times what local people pay. They have exchange rates that are bizarre and change by the minute. These people live with this every single day.

The government of Maduro stages raids into formal grocery stores to impose arbitrary price controls, leaving the owners unable to stock their shelves or run a functioning business. If there is a rumor that there are eggs for sale somewhere in Caracas, there is a rush to that location, and people wait for hours in the hopes that they can buy eggs.

As a result, informal markets are springing up trying to meet the people's demands. Yet even while I walked through these markets, I saw long lines. From the second floor in the back, in the dark, there was a long line waiting. I went to the front to see what they were waiting for. They wanted to buy toilet paper.

Business leaders told me that they are being vilified by the government, forced to sell products below cost and out of markets so the government can be the exclusive seller of imported goods.

Listen to this. They also shared stories of workers fainting on the job from hunger. Of particular concern, one of the largest employers in Venezuela said they decided they had to start bringing fruit to the workplace in the morning so their workers could get something to eat. When they fainted, it was not only dangerous to them but to people around them, and they wanted to keep their workers awake. Only one out of three people in Venezuela eats three meals a day. There are children fainting at school.

The government has run the state oil industry into collapse, treating it as its cash cow and as a way to line their pockets. Currently, there is little or no investment in the oil industry, the national oil industry of Venezuela. There is little or no maintenance, and there is a mass exodus of skilled personnel and engineers. What would an engineer working for a Venezuelan national oil company earn in the course of a year? Dramatically more than most Venezuelans—\$1,700 a year in annual income. What do they earn in other countries in Latin America with the same skills? They would earn an average income of \$85,000 a year. Is it any surprise they are leaving?

It is also no surprise that the country is suffering a heartbreaking humanitarian crisis, one that is notable for malnutrition and a breakdown of basic public health. Brave and dedicated healthcare workers—and I have met some; NGO leaders told me of a shortage of vaccines with outbreaks of measles and diphtheria that haven't been

seen for decades. Malaria is at record levels.

When the public health officials gave me a briefing on the public health crisis of Venezuela, they said that the maternal mortality rate—the death of mothers—is at the level it was 50 years ago, the early 1960s. The same thing is true for infant mortality—that high a level. You have to go to South Sudan, Yemen, or Syria to find comparable public health crises, and those three countries are all at war. Venezuela is at war with itself. In fact, one expert said that the outbreak of measles, diphtheria, and malaria was the worst he had seen, certainly the worst in all of South America.

With Venezuelans flooding into neighboring countries, many of them are spreading diseases that have been cured in so many countries around the world. Basic diabetes, asthma, and HIV treatments are simply not available. For 4 months now, HIV patients have not been given medication.

A staggering number of hospitals cannot perform basic services. Many do not have any capacity to perform a blood test. There are no x ray machines available on a 24/7 basis. Many of them don't have electricity. Some do not even have clean water.

Venezuelans are suffering malnutrition, and it is particularly acute for children, who suffer for a lifetime due to stunted brain development. One expert said that the rates of malnutrition have affected more than 8 percent of the population. In some areas, the percentage of people suffering from malnutrition is as high as 15 percent. You can see it on the streets of Caracas. When you look at the public parks, you see these children—thin limbs, spindly legs and arms, and you think to yourself: These kids are not getting enough to eat.

It is hard to know precisely about all of these statistics because the government has officially stopped collecting and releasing information. They leave it up to private organizations.

What I found particularly cruel is the government's supposed effort to help with hunger. A provision of a monthly food basket was linked to having the right political identification card. Sadly, these food boxes are imported. Someone is making a lot of money in that process, with corrupt middlemen taking a cut at multiple steps along the way, all to provide a politically manipulated lifeline that meets only 7 of the 12 basic food needs.

The regime has also linked these food rations to polling stations during elections, which brings me to the third overlapping crisis, a democratic crisis. Let me acknowledge that Hugo Chavez did, in fact, win his initial terms in democratic elections. He tapped into public disenchantment with the failure of traditional governing parties to address the deep chasms of poverty in Venezuela. He even said "I am not the cause, I am the consequence," referring to his rise to power. But his election,

like that of so many other autocrats at heart, also brought the steady dismantling of the country's democracy, a path followed by the current President.

You see, in Venezuela, political parties that look threatening are arbitrarily banned. Political opponents who appear to be popular are jailed or exiled or just plain disqualified from running for office. Government institutions, like the Venezuelan election commission, are simply political tools of the regime. The rule of law has collapsed.

In 2015, the opposition won a sweeping victory in legislative elections. What happened next? The President of Venezuela, Maduro, installed an illegitimate rubberstamp constituent assembly to usurp the legitimately elected National Assembly. It was his way of stopping his opponents. The supreme court and national election council are stacked with partisan cronies who do whatever the regime asks, regardless of the law.

Now, with the country on the edge of economic collapse, the President has called for a snap election on May 20—more than 6 months before it traditionally would be held. He wants to move quickly, for fear that he might lose. Maduro doesn't want to risk losing even under a rigged system, so he is rushing forward with this election that doesn't even come close to meeting established international standards.

What I found, and bears repeating, is that the critics of the Venezuelan Government regime and their actions are not confined to the United States or Canada. They include Central American countries like Panama and South American countries, which have expressed their displeasure with Maduro's actions, as well as the European Union's displeasure. The parties and candidates still remain arbitrarily banned. There is zero trust in discredited election commissions, and registration and voting processes have been dramatically manipulated.

I met with some of the opposition leaders, and they told me what happens when people try to vote. They have to go through an elaborate process with a machine to register to vote. It is controlled. It takes too much time. It limits the opposition from registering their voters. There is little time for a legitimate campaign, especially with government control of the media. Reputable, long-term election monitors are nowhere to be seen, and none seem to be planned for the actual election, either.

Under these conditions, how can any such election be credible? If President Maduro proceeds with this May 20 election under these circumstances, he is going to find Venezuela further isolated.

Amid these deeply troubling and ominous conditions, I nonetheless met many brave and dedicated Venezuelans who are trying to endure and reverse this horrible situation. Doctors, nurses, civic leaders, business people,

politicians, and so many others are sharing food and medicine, running for office and facing the threat of arrest or exile, documenting human rights abuses in the shrinking media state, trying to run businesses in a broken economy. It is an incredible act of courage each day.

I also met with former political prisoners, political opposition members, and their families who are under constant threat or already under some kind of arrest. I would name them here, but to do so would put them in danger in Venezuela. I was moved by their dedication and humanity.

I am haunted by the comments of one group of young idealists. Over dinner Friday night in Caracas, they talked about the future. They said: If we called the same group of five opposition leaders together a year from now, we would be lucky if three showed up. Two of us will be exiled or jailed between now and then. That is what they face by being political opponents of the current regime. I fear how many of Venezuela's most talented will be sacrificed under these conditions.

The regime is also tragically holding a U.S. citizen, Josh Holt of Utah, on criminal charges. The charges are nonsense. I visited with Josh Holt in his prison. The prison is known locally as hell on earth. Josh and his Venezuelan wife have served 21 months, with no end in sight, and they still haven't gone through the criminal process. He is suffering, and he should be. It is understandable. He is clearly being held as a political hostage. I appealed to the President and every member of the government to release this young man and his Venezuelan wife and her daughter so that they could come back to the United States. Keeping Josh Holt as a political hostage will just isolate the Maduro regime even more. I am one of a bipartisan group of Members in Congress who will continue to push for his immediate release.

Lastly, I want to note that every time I go on one of these trips overseas, including to some of the most far-flung corners of the globe, I am always moved by the group of talented Americans working for us and representing us; those are the men and women in our Embassies, without exception. Under the Charge d'Affaires, Todd Robinson, our Embassy team in Caracas is a point of great pride and outstanding public service. The conditions under which they are forced to operate are extraordinarily stressful.

There was some small hope that negotiations led by the Vatican and regional leaders or most recently hosted in the Dominican Republic could lead to some kind of path forward between the Venezuelan Government and the opposition before it is too late, but all of these have failed. Some hoped years ago that a group known as the Boston Group—American and Venezuelan elected officials—might be the beginning of a dialogue and might be continued to this day, but it is increasingly

difficult to see that possibility. I met some of the Venezuelan Boston Group members. Several of them are deeply committed to this administration currently in power. Many of them talk about changes that need to be made in Venezuela. I haven't given up hope completely that there may be some voices that can move this country back to a civilized status.

Let me be clear in my concluding message to the Venezuelan Government, specifically, a message that they should proceed with an election that meets the following basic standards: All political prisoners must be released, and all candidates and parties must be allowed to compete. There must be at least 6 months for a legitimate campaign. The national election council should be restructured and led by a credible group of professionals on an evenly divided partisan basis so that it isn't loaded for one party or another. There must be no linking of food with voting or political party affiliation. The National Assembly must have its powers restored. Credible international and local election monitors must be allowed to observe preelection and actual election processes, with full accreditation and access. Going forward otherwise will only bring more suffering to the people of Venezuela and more isolation to their nation.

Republicans and Democrats don't agree on much these days, certainly not here in Washington on Capitol Hill, but we do agree that Venezuela and the consequences of President Maduro's regime continue to lead that nation down a negative path, a path of suffering.

I yield the floor.

CHINA AND TRADE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I preface my remarks today about China with a recent article from *The Economist*, dated March 1, 2018, which, I think, does a very good job of crystalizing what the hopes and aspirations that we in the West had for China and what the reality has turned out to be.

It points out that in March 2000, Bill Clinton divided the American opinion on China into two camps. The first, he said, was of the optimists, and the second was of the hawks and the pessimists. The optimists, as it describes it, have an eye on the future and can see China becoming the next great capitalist tiger with the biggest market in the world. That was the optimistic view. *The Economist* writes that the hawks and pessimists, who were stuck in the past, saw China as stubbornly remaining as the world's last, great Communist dragon and a threat to stability in Asia.

As this article points out, it was not an either/or. It called it a both/and. It concludes that the China of Xi Jinping is a great mercantilist dragon that is under strict Communist Party control and that it is using the power of its vast markets to cow and co-opt capitalist rivals to bend and break the rules-based order and to push America to the periphery of the Asia-Pacific re-

gion. It calls this one of the starkest reversals in modern geopolitics.

Indeed, the administration's national security strategy that President Trump rolled out just a couple of months ago states that China challenges American power, influence, and interests. It points out again that the hopes and aspirations of the optimists appear to have been dashed. Instead, we have one of the starkest reversals in modern geopolitics. This leads me to the subject I want to at least start talking about because it does relate to China.

Today, in the Subcommittee on International Trade, within the Senate Finance Committee, which I happen to chair, we are convening a hearing on trade issues and China. The core issue my colleagues and I will examine involves challenges to U.S. businesses, manufacturers, and service providers who are trying to get access to the Chinese market—a market that represents the second largest economy in the world. China, of course, has almost unfettered access to the United States. There are important protections in place, like the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, which does look at some of those investments to make sure our national security interests are not compromised.

By and large, China has open access to the United States and the U.S. market. China is the United States' largest merchandise trading partner and the third largest export market for U.S. goods abroad. Although the legitimate flow of goods and services between the United States and China has increased over the years and is, in many respects, a positive thing, statistics alone do not capture the whole story, hence the preface that I gave about *The Economist's* view of what has changed in China.

Unfortunately, while Chinese companies largely enjoy open access to U.S. markets and an economy that is receptive to foreign investment, U.S. companies are not afforded reciprocity in this regard. In his State of the Union Message, the President made that point, which is that in our trading relationships, we expect reciprocity—in other words, to treat our trading partners the same way they treat us—hopefully, to everybody's advantage.

U.S. companies that seek to do business in China often encounter—I would say always encounter—a protectionist system, one that employs predatory tactics and promotes domestic industries over foreign competitors, many of which receive State subsidies. In many cases, China has used trade as a weapon and coerced U.S. companies to enter into joint ventures or other business arrangements that require a company to hand over its key technology and know-how—the so-called secret sauce of its business—in order to gain market access.

This practice has already begun to erode America's technological advantage and undermine our defense industrial base, which is something that

should concern all of us and is the subject of a revision of the Committee on Foreign Investment of the United States, CFIUS, statute that is going to be coming out of the Senate Banking Committee and the House Financial Services Committee. It will be an updating of the CFIUS process to meet the challenges of today.

Of course, under section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974, the Trump administration is currently considering potential investment restrictions to address the harm that has resulted from China's effort to acquire sensitive technologies through investments. I look forward to working with the President and others to ensure that the proper steps are taken, but the real issues are clear, and we will be considering them in more detail at the hearing this afternoon on China's restrictive market.

Even though multiple administrations have attempted to engage Chinese leaders on their trade practices, the high-level diplomatic talks have generally yielded little progress and have often resulted in commitments with zero follow-up action. Discussions may continue in the future, but China's market access reforms are still too slow, and real barriers exist. Reciprocal treatment for U.S. companies should not be too much to ask. Indeed, it is the minimum we should insist upon. It is my hope that today's hearing will paint a clear picture of the problems that persist with access to Chinese markets and that significant reforms will follow.

JUDGES

Mr. President, on a second brief matter, I will mention that yesterday was the 1-year anniversary of Neil Gorsuch joining the U.S. Supreme Court.

Former Attorney General Ed Meese called Justice Gorsuch someone in the mold of the late Justice Antonin Scalia—an impartial judge who applies laws as they are written and who shows an abiding respect for the rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution.

As I have numerous times in the past, I commend President Trump on his outstanding selection, and I congratulate Justice Gorsuch on his first year of serving on our Nation's highest Court.

Let's not forget that Justice Gorsuch is not the only good news when it comes to the Federal judiciary. He is only one part of a much larger and, often, untold story. As of earlier this month, 30 article III Federal life tenure judges have been confirmed under President Trump's tenure—30. That is due, in large part, to the commitment of the Senate, under our majority leader's leadership, to making sure that this was a priority—to confirm judges who have been passed out of the Judiciary Committee here on the floor of the Senate and to maximize our floor time in order to get that priority accomplished.

My home State has filled two appellate vacancies, as well as two district

vacancies so far. Additionally, five accomplished lawyers are waiting for hearings for Texas district vacancies, and two more are waiting to be confirmed for those vacancies. So is Andy Oldham, who is an accomplished lawyer who has been nominated to fill the third seat on the Fifth Circuit since President Trump has become President. I hope we will continue to move all of these judicial nominees and many more across the country very soon.

I know there is a lot of focus on the executive branch and the legislative branch, but I believe the judiciary is the bedrock of our government as it ensures that equal justice is available to all, no matter what one's station in life. It is the rule of law that enables all of our other freedoms to be possible. It enables our economy to flourish, and it creates opportunities for our people so that they can pursue their dreams. That is how important I believe the judiciary is, and we should never forget it.

Yesterday, President Trump took another important step in this area when he announced he would be nominating David Morales to fill one of the vacancies I just mentioned, this one in Corpus Christi, TX, in the U.S. Southern District. David has extensive experience in working for the Texas attorney general and the Governor, as well as in the University of Texas system. He was recommended by Senator CRUZ and my Federal Judicial Evaluation Committee—a bipartisan group of the best and brightest lawyers the State of Texas has to offer. David was recommended to us by what we call the FJEC. It performs a great service not only to Senator CRUZ and me but to the public, generally, in its vetting of these potential nominees for judicial service and its recommending them to us. David Morales will bring more than 23 years of complex litigation and agency dispute resolution to bear.

I hope our colleagues will join me in making sure his nomination is swiftly considered and that he is confirmed.

I think David and the other Texans whom President Trump has nominated will make excellent additions to our courts. They are the kinds of people we should want in our courts—those who will impartially ensure that justice is done and the law, as written, is followed no matter who the litigant is or the type of controversy at issue.

FIGHT ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING ACT

Finally, Mr. President, for the skeptics who like to say that nothing good ever gets done here in Washington, I will mention one other item and the real positive consequences of a bill we just passed and that is being signed into law by the President today—the Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, FOSTA.

The effort to pass it was led by our colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN. I and others were honored to serve as original cosponsors of this legislation in the Senate. We

have been working on this issue since at least 2012, when I introduced a resolution, along with a bipartisan group of my colleagues, that called for backpage.com to cease its facilitation of human trafficking, including of children, and prostitution by eliminating the adult section of the website. We had to pass this law because, when it would go to court, under the Communications Decency Act, it was able to claim that Congress had not carved out a provision for trafficking, just merely for child pornography. Thus, it had escaped our attempts to bring it to justice in the past.

This important legislation goes along with a bill we passed in 2015, called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which refocused our efforts on fighting the sex trade here in the United States by targeting those who purchased human trafficking victims, providing services to the survivors of this crime, and giving law enforcement new tools to target the organized networks that are responsible for commercial sexual exploitation. That was just a few years ago. Yet, just this last month, as I said, we changed section 230 of the Communications Decency Act to allow State attorneys general and victims to seek justice against websites that knowingly assist or facilitate commercial sexual exploitation and child sex trafficking.

The good news is that since that time, a grand jury in Arizona has indicted 7 people, who are affiliated with backpage, on 93 counts of money laundering, facilitating prostitution, and other crimes. The indictment alleged that the website essentially operated as a highly lucrative online brothel.

After we passed FOSTA, the Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, some websites announced major policy changes and shut down sections that may have helped to enslave and entrap young women. So it has not just been the indictment and, hopefully, the conviction of people who facilitated backpage over the years, but it has also had a deterrent effect on other websites that have done similar things and has encouraged them, in their own self-interests, to shut down those sections that have helped to facilitate human trafficking.

Backpage has now been seized by Federal law enforcement. It can no longer serve as an open forum for the exploitation of children and the purchase of human beings for sexual slavery. These are all positive signs that the law we have enacted is making a real difference, ensuring that this malignant conduct does not go unpunished. The prosecution and dismantling of backpage has sent a clear message to the pimps and the buyers responsible for sexual slavery, resulting in the shutdown of many other sites involved in the commercial sex trade. This includes message boards where individuals post accounts of the sexual assaults of women and children as if they were reviewing a restaurant menu or product.

As I said yesterday, with reference to Facebook, the internet can be a very good thing, but we can't be naive in ignoring the dangers it represents when put to a perverse use to women, children, and others. What we did with FOSTA, or the Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, is an unqualified good thing. It is something that Republicans and Democrats worked on together with the President to pass and to sign into law. It is a good thing that we changed the provisions that inadvertently shielded the facilitators of sex trafficking online. It is one way we can make the internet a safer place for everyone.

I applaud the bipartisan efforts of the Members here in both Chambers of Congress, as well as the President for his support. For those who think nothing good ever comes out of Washington these days and that Democrats and Republicans can't get along to pursue the public interest, this is exhibit No. 1, which I would offer, of the most recent efforts we have made to shut down this modern day human slavery.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on the confirmation of John Ring to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, NLRB. I am glad that we are voting on this nomination because, once Mr. Ring is confirmed, we will once again have a full five-member National Labor Relations Board.

Created in 1935, the NLRB administers the National Labor Relations Act, which seeks to mitigate and eliminate labor-related impediments to the free flow of commerce. The 5 board members have 5-year, staggered terms, and the general counsel has a 4-year term.

The NLRB should be a neutral umpire in labor disputes. While Board partisanship did not start under President Obama, it became worse under him. An overly partisan Board creates instability in our Nation's workplaces and does not serve the intent of the law, which is to create stable labor relations and the free flow of commerce.

The NLRB under President Obama took two particularly harmful actions that are still in place today. First, the joint employer decision threatens the American dream for owners of the Nation's 780,000 franchise locations. Under that decision, companies could find it much more practical to own all their stores and restaurants and daycare centers themselves, rather than encourage more franchisee-owned small businesses.

Second is the ambush election rule, which can force a union election before employers and employees have a chance to figure out what is going on. The rule also forces employers to provide union organizers with a list of employees' work locations, shifts, job classifications, personal email addresses, and home and cellular telephone numbers. This information is highly personal, and employees may not want

it shared, but workers do not have a choice. I am pleased the Board is accepting comments on whether this rule should be revised.

A fully staffed board is vital to both employees and employers, and I am not the only one who thinks that is important. At a Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, HELP, hearing in September 2014, then-Chairman Harkin said, "Keeping the NLRB fully staffed and able to do its work will send a strong message to the American people that yes, Washington can work, and our government can function."

While attending the Catholic University Columbus School of Law in the evening, Mr. Ring worked for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. After law school, he joined the law firm Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, where he has worked since 1988. Mr. Ring flourished at the firm, where he worked his way up from summer associate to coleader of the firm's labor and management relations practice.

Mr. Ring was nominated to be a member of the NLRB on January 18, 2018. The HELP Committee held Mr. Ring's hearing on March 1, 2018, and he completed all paperwork in accordance with the committee's rules, practices, and procedures. We received Mr. Ring's HELP Committee paperwork and his Office of Government Ethics paperwork on January 24, 2018, 36 days before his hearing. Mr. Ring offered to meet with all HELP Committee members and met with five of them, including two Democrats. Following his hearing, Mr. Ring responded to 97 questions for the record, or 158, if you include subquestions. These responses were provided to Senators prior to the markup, and the HELP Committee favorably reported Mr. Ring's nomination on March 14, 2018.

I look forward to voting for John Ring, and I trust that he will serve with distinction.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this week the Senate is considering two important labor-related nominations: the nominations of John Ring to serve as a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, NLRB, and Patrick Pizzella to serve as Deputy Secretary of Labor, DOL. Unfortunately, given the nominees' well-documented hostility to the collective bargaining rights of working men and women, I will not vote to confirm either of them.

If Mr. Ring is confirmed, he will restore the Board to the 3-2 anti-labor majority, with no assurances that President Trump will fill the Democratic seat of former chairman Mark Gaston Pearce expiring this summer. It is important to note here that nominations to the NLRB have traditionally been confirmed in bipartisan pairs.

Mr. Ring authored blog posts calling the NLRB an "activist" organization during the Obama administration. In other blog posts, he characterized the NLRB's union election procedures as "some of the biggest assaults on em-

ployer rights in recent history." In fact, the election rule simply modernized union election procedures and has actually resulted in slightly fewer union elections.

During the brief 3-2 Republican majority late last year before then-Board Chairman Phillip Miscimarra completed his term on December 16, 2017, the NLRB rushed to overturn landmark decisions, weakening workers' rights under the National Labor Relations Act, NLRA, and undermining the statute's core purpose of promoting collective bargaining, including the Browning-Ferris Industries joint employer standard decision. The Board's inspector general has faulted those efforts, and the Board has been forced to vacate the joint employer decision. A new Republican majority may reorganize the NLRB in ways that are unfavorable to workers and their collective bargaining rights.

Mr. Pizzella is a vocal advocate of so-called right-to-work laws. They really ought to be called right-to-be-exploited laws. As Ross Eisenbray of the Economic Policy Institute reported last year, "Wages are 3.1 percent lower in so-called 'right to work' (RTW) states, for union and nonunion workers alike—after correctly accounting for differences in cost of living, demographics, and labor market characteristics. The negative impact of RTW laws translates to \$1,558 less a year in earnings for a typical full-time worker."

There is a clear correlation between the decline in union membership and stagnant wages. If the Senate confirms Mr. Pizzella and Mr. Ring, the Republican assault on unions and collective bargaining rights enshrined in the National Labor Relations Act, NLRA, will gain momentum, and working people and their families will suffer as a result.

Mr. Pizzella previously served at the Department of Labor, as Assistant Secretary of Labor for Administration and Management under President George W. Bush. During Mr. Pizzella's previous tenure at DOL, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, determined that the Department left workers vulnerable to unscrupulous employers while investigating complaints of minimum wage, overtime, and child labor violations. GAO found that the Wage and Hour Division's complaint intake, complaint resolution, and investigation processes were ineffective and discouraged workers from lodging wage-theft complaints.

Mr. Pizzella also has expressed his antipathy to Federal workers and their unions. I am proud to represent many of these public servants. The Federal workforce is one of our Nation's finest assets, and public sector unions make it more productive.

It is ironic that the Senate is considering two nominees this week who are

openly hostile to the collective bargaining rights of working people. Yesterday was Equal Pay Day, which symbolizes the number of extra days a typical woman who works full-time, year-round must work into 2018 to be paid what a typical man was paid in 2017. Women are still only paid 80 cents for every dollar paid to a man, a yearly pay difference of \$10,086, and the disparity is even worse for many women of color.

Based on an analysis of Census Bureau data, the National Partnership for Women and Families is releasing a study which concludes that, in sum, women employed full time in the U.S. will lose nearly \$900 billion to the wage gap this year. If the wage gap were closed, on average, a working woman in this country would be able to afford more than 1 additional year of tuition and fees for a 4-year public university, 74 more weeks of food for her family, nearly 7 more months of mortgage and utility payments, or 14 more months of childcare.

If Mr. Ring and Mr. Pizzella and President Trump are unwilling to protect female workers and try to close that pay gap, which seems likely, then let us let us arm women with the most powerful tool in our legal system: the U.S. Constitution. Let us finally pass the Equal Rights Amendment, ERA.

The ERA is barely longer than a tweet, but it would finally give women full and equal protection under the Constitution. Section 1 of the ERA states, quite simply, that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

When Congress proposed the ERA in 1972, it provided that the measure had to be ratified by three-fourths of the States—38 States—within 7 years. This deadline was later extended to 10 years by a joint resolution, but ultimately only 35 out of 38 States had ratified the ERA when the deadline expired in 1982. Note that the deadline wasn't contained in the amendment itself; the deadline was in the text of the joint resolution.

Article V of the Constitution contains no time limits for the ratification of amendments, so the ERA deadline is arbitrary. To put the matter in context, the 27th Amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits congressional pay raises without an intervening election, was ratified in 1992, 203 years after it was first proposed.

The Senate should vote on a Senate Joint Resolution I have introduced—S.J. Res. 5—to remove the ERA deadline, and every State in our Union that has not yet taken up its consideration should do so without any further delay.

Nevada became the 36th State to ratify the amendment last March, leaving the ERA just two States short of the required three-fourths of the States threshold under the Constitution if the deadline were to be abolished.

The ERA would incorporate a ban on gender-based discrimination, explicitly

written or otherwise, into the Constitution. It could change outcomes in discrimination cases by requiring the Supreme Court to use the higher standard of "strict scrutiny" when assessing those cases, the same standard used in racial and religious discrimination cases.

I think many—perhaps most—Americans would be shocked to learn that our Constitution has no provision expressly prohibiting gender discrimination.

In a 2011 interview, the late Justice Antonin Scalia summed up the need for an Equal Rights Amendment best. He said, "Certainly the Constitution does not require discrimination on the basis of sex. The only issue is whether it prohibits it. It doesn't."

So I ask my Senate colleagues this question most sincerely: Are we willing to do what must be done to prohibit gender discrimination in the Constitution? The people being affected by systemic gender inequality are our constituents. They are our mothers, sisters, wives, daughters, and our granddaughters. They are American citizens who deserve basic respect and equality.

It is time to end the assault on working families in this country. Let's end discrimination by making it possible to ratify the ERA. Let's close the pay gap. Let's stop denigrating Federal workers. Let's support, not attack, the collective bargaining rights that are the cornerstone of a strong middle class. I regret that the Senate is poised to confirm two individuals who are unlikely to assist these efforts. We can and must do better.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

FAIR TRADE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, let me do a quick history lesson with this body. In 1773, the Colonies we were getting more and more frustrated with King George. There were a lot of issues we raised with him—a lot of taxes, a lot of changes, things that were happening in the judiciary, things that were arbitrary that were coming down. Then it boiled to a head.

In December of 1773, a group of American colonists went out to Boston infuriated with the tariff policy over tea. The British East India Company had special access that no one else had. They had no taxes and everyone else had a tax—a tariff. It pushed out all of the other companies except for the British East India Company. A group of American colonists went out to one of the ships, grabbed all the tea in the harbor, and threw it overboard, creating the legendary Boston Tea Party.

That was an argument about tariffs. It was an argument about international trade. It was an argument about American companies and fair trade, and we still talk about it today.

It is interesting to note that in our letter that Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1776, which we now call the Declaration of Independence, in the long list of grievances that we wrote out to King

George, we included this line: We are cutting off our trade with all parts of the world as one of our big grievances. That grievance fell between the grievance of the British Government allowing British soldiers to murder inhabitants in America and our taxes without consent. In between those was cutting off our international trade. We have been free traders as a nation since even before we were a nation, and we have been passionate about keeping it fair but keeping it free and keeping it open.

Free trade is a big issue for us, and for some reason it has become this big national conversation again. Should we have free and fair trade? Should we continue to engage? What does it mean to have a deficit in our trade? Does it have to be equal with every country, that they buy from us as much as we buy from them? Suddenly, this has become a brand-new dialogue again.

I wish to bring a couple of real world moments to this, beginning with the history lesson, by stating that trade—and international trade, specifically—was important to us even before we were a country. We were gathering supplies from all over the world to be able to do our basic production. We are still doing that today.

For some reason I run into people that think this international supply chain is something new in this generation. I tell them that they should look at our history and see that the United States has always had an international supply chain.

We are also 25 percent of the world's economy. There is no nation in the world that can afford to buy as much from us as we buy from them. We are the largest economy in the world, by far. We are going to buy more from other countries.

The issue is, How does this work in our economy and how do we make sure we protect American manufacturing and the American consumer at the same time? Let me walk through what this looks like.

Charlie and Mary Swanson are Oklahomans and third-generation farmers and ranchers who live in Roosevelt, OK, with a whopping population of 241. The agricultural products they produce help feed the world. They raise wheat, cotton, cattle, and milo.

Every year their crops are harvested using John Deere equipment. We look at the John Deere tractor and its beautiful green and we think: That is a great American company, except that parts of the equipment also come in its original form from Mexico. Parts come from India, and parts from Germany. Most of the parts come from the United States. They employ 60,000 people in the United States.

It is a great American company—John Deere—but their cabs are made in Germany. Their hydraulic cylinders are made in Mexico. The castings from the foundry are from Iowa, but the guidance products are from California. Some of the transmission and electronic parts come from India, and

other parts are from Missouri. We see that as a great American tractor.

The crews that harvest some of the Swanson's crops are folks that come in—legally, by the way—from New Zealand, Ireland, or South Africa. The wheat they produce goes to export markets all over the world. Some of it goes to Egypt, some to India, Japan, and South Korea.

Their cotton is used all over the United States, but it is also shipped to China, as well, to produce fabrics. Some of the fabrics end up being made into garments that are shipped from Vietnam. Some of them end up right back here in the United States again, having started from the cotton from Roosevelt, OK.

The milo they raise goes to feed. Most of that feed goes to Texas. If you are from Oklahoma, you may consider that international trade, but it is still domestic trade. A lot of the feed goes to China.

They raise cattle, our great American beef. We eat as much beef as we can possibly eat in Oklahoma, and the rest of it we ship all over the world. Their beef is used in Oklahoma and all across the United States, but it is also sent to Japan, Korea, and Mexico.

Understand this, just as an aside: In 2017, U.S. beef producers exported 1.2 million metric tons of beef worth \$2 billion. That is just American beef going around the world. Two leading partners in that are Canada and Mexico—\$980 million in exports. It is a big part of what they do.

Charlie Swanson drives a Ford F-150 pickup. It is a great American product; isn't it? It is a great Ford truck. That F-150, by the way, is a fantastic vehicle. It is completely assembled in the United States, but the aluminum in that great American truck comes from Canada. About 15 percent of the components in that great American truck come from Mexico. Some parts even come from China. That F-150 is not only used extensively in the United States, but it is also shipped around the world. There are a lot of F-150 trucks on the roads in Mexico, Canada, and, yes, even in China.

That F-150 rides on four good, solid American-made tires, but the steel cord in those good American tires comes from all over the world. The steel in most of our tires is not made in the United States. A lot of the chemicals that go into the production of those tires are from Europe, Asia, and Latin America. They are good American tires. A lot of them are made in Oklahoma in the Goodyear facility—a phenomenal facility—or the Michelin plant in Ardmore. They make great American tires for a lot of vehicles all across the United States, but they have parts and pieces from around the world in those American-made tires, and they are shipping them out as well. So just speaking about Charlie and what is happening in Roosevelt, OK, population 241, the products they produce are going all over the world. The products

they use, such as the John Deere tractor and the Ford F-150 with the Goodyear or Michelin tires are American-made, but are dependent on trade from all around the world.

I could talk about Dr. Brent Hancock, born and raised in Kiowa County, OK. He left Kiowa County and went to the big city of Stillwater to attend Oklahoma State University, where he received his doctor of veterinary medicine degree. He returned back to Kiowa County and opened a veterinary clinic in Hobart in 1995. For over 20 years, Dr. Hancock has been taking care of vaccinations for sheep, cattle, pigs, goats, cats, and dogs. It is also rumored that Dr. Hancock can operate on your rabbit, but that is a whole different story.

He vaccinates these animals with vaccines to provide some of the safest agricultural products in the world. Some of those vaccines come from companies like Bayer, which is an international company based in Germany. He also uses products from Merck. They have offices in 50 countries, and they produce and ship their products to 140 countries around the world.

Again, we look at him and say that he is a good American veterinarian. He must be all American, but he actually depends on products from all over the world to provide basic things.

I cannot talk about Oklahoma without talking about oil and gas. Most of the pipe that goes down the hole in most of our wells is produced from steel that is not made in America. That particular type of steel that is down holding those wells is produced around the world but not here. We are dependent upon oil and gas that goes in the F-150 pickup and the John Deere tractor, and a part of it relies on steel from around the world.

I can take you to Tulsa, OK—slightly larger than Kiowa County, I would say—to a manufacturing plant called SWEP. They employ 100 people and produce components for refrigerators and air conditioners. They import products from Europe, and they combine them with products that they are making in the United States and assemble them. That final product is sold all over the country and is also sold to Canada and Mexico—all from one company in Tulsa, OK.

Drive up the road from Tulsa to Bartlesville to a manufacturing plant operated by ABB. They create a lot of products that are in wells, pipelines, and refineries all across America. That company imports products from suppliers from Canada and Mexico, and they create a final product that is sold all over the United States, and they sell it right back to Canada and Mexico as well.

This shouldn't be shocking to anyone. This is the same structure that we have had since the 1700s as Colonies. We produce some of our products and ship them out. We buy some to be able to use in manufacturing. This is a nation that is very interconnected to the

world, and it is exceptionally important that our trade agreements get resolved as fast as possible.

I want fair trade. We had unfair trade in 1773 that we protested in the Boston Harbor. We still want fair trade agreements right now, but those trade agreements need to be resolved as fast as possible. Farmers and ranchers in Oklahoma cannot wait a year to find out what is going to happen in our trade policy. Some of them are on the edge of the knife right now of bankruptcy. They can't get anything on the futures market to try to figure out what is happening in the now to be able to make the basic investments they need to make for this year's crops.

Predictability helps us, just like fair and free trade does. So while I understand full well that the administration is engaging in trade negotiations around the world, I encourage them to move from talking about these trade agreements to settling them—getting them resolved with Mexico and Canada and getting the best deal that we can have, resetting this agreement with NAFTA for another generation to prepare us for the future. Let's get that resolved. Those are our two largest trading partners. Resolve our trade agreement with Korea, locking that one in and finishing out all the area around Asia as well. Twelve of those nations have already resolved the trade agreements they are into, putting us behind. Those nations are forming contracts now. We need to engage as soon as we possibly can.

There are big issues with China and trade. They have not been fair in all their trade agreements. We need to resolve our issues with China, and I am pleased that this administration is leaning in to resolve a long-term issue with China trade. It is about time someone does it, but we also need to get it resolved. We don't need retaliatory tariffs moving across every industry in our Nation destabilizing what we are doing in the economy. Let's get these issues resolved.

Quite frankly, many of the trade issues that we have with the rest of the world aren't their tariffs, but they are our regulations. When our regulations and American redtape from our own government slow down our own economy, let's deal with our own house to make sure what we produce is competitive around the world, but in the meantime, let's move our trade conversations to trade agreements so we can continue to move on toward doing the same thing we have done since the 1700s as Americans; that is, trading with the entire world and leading the world with it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Alaska.

CHINA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, as we all know, our country is facing a lot of challenges, particularly overseas, and a lot of them are in the news—Iran, Syria, North Korea. When you

look out across the landscape of what the big, long-term, geostrategic challenges are that face our Nation, in my view, there is no doubt that the No. 1 challenge economically and from a national security standpoint is the rise of China as a great power. We need to be thinking about that a lot more because that is going to be the issue our country faces, not just this year or next year but for decades.

I come from the great State of Alaska. We are an Asia-Pacific State. We are always looking to that region—as a matter of fact, we are in that region. My hometown of Anchorage is closer to Tokyo than it is to Washington, DC. What I see as a positive on this issue—having been someone in this body for a little over 3 years, I have come down to the floor and talked a lot about this challenge, the rise of China. It is a little concerning that a couple of years ago nobody was talking about it. Very few people were talking about it, but that is changing, and I think that is positive.

It is changing. This administration is focusing, and it is changing with my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans. Certainly, this is an area where, I think, there is a lot of agreement. I was just presiding for the last hour. The majority whip and the Senator from Oklahoma both were talking about issues dealing with China and trade and strategy, and that is positive.

The administration is talking about it. If you look at the national security strategy of the Trump administration, they are starting to focus on this issue. Front and center is the return of great power rivalries, with China as the leading, pacing threat and challenge, but it is also an opportunity for this great Nation of ours.

When you look at the history of our country, particularly post-World War II, the United States set up the international system—the international trading system and security system. We have been leading them, and so many countries—hundreds of millions of people in the world—benefited from that. The irony, of course, is that the one country that benefited probably more than almost anyone is China.

The rise of China was not only helped, but it was spurred by the American international trading system, the sealanes of commerce that we have kept open for decades. So there was a moment in the last couple of decades where we reached out very much—there was a great speech by our former Deputy Secretary of State in the Bush administration, a gentleman by the name of Bob Zoellick, who went on to become head of the World Bank. He asked in a speech to the Chinese: You need to now become a responsible stakeholder in this system that we created because you have benefited so dramatically. You are big, you are powerful, and now help become a stakeholder in the international order that we set up. Here is the offer to you.

Well, unfortunately, whether it is a Democrat or Republican, in the national security and foreign policy realm, most people are sensing that China has rejected that notion. No, we are not going to be a responsible stakeholder in your system. We are going to set up our own system. As a matter of fact, we might even try to undermine your system—the global system set up by the United States of America by Democrats and Republicans over decades.

You see it everywhere, whether it is decades-long theft of intellectual property, whether it is high tariffs, whether it is any American company coming into China and being forced to transfer their technology. No other countries do this to China, but they are doing it to our companies and have been doing that for decades.

So there is a rethinking right now. Clearly, the Trump administration is thinking about what the new strategy should be. The national security strategy of this administration, which I commend people to read—it is quite a good document, written by the outgoing National Security Advisor, H.R. McMaster—focuses a lot on this issue of reciprocity and great power rivalry again.

So as we are thinking about it, I would like to briefly touch on three principles I think will be key as we debate this. As we help formulate this—hopefully, in a bipartisan manner—this issue is going to be with us for decades. There are three key principles.

The first key principle is reciprocity—true reciprocity. The majority whip was just talking about this. The national security strategy of the Trump administration talks a lot about it. The President talks a lot about this. This is just a fairness issue. As I mentioned, there is IPR theft; high tariffs; the forced tech transfer from American companies to China; giant, subsidized, state-owned enterprises and state-backed investment funds buying up companies all over the world. No other country does that to China.

So when you look at the issue of reciprocity, I would like to break it down into a positive and negative. You have negative reciprocity. If we can't do that in your country, you shouldn't be able to do it in our country. It is pretty simple, pretty fair, and everybody understands that.

Then there is positive reciprocity. One thing I have been encouraging the Chinese to do for many years—and I have been over there a lot and spent a lot of time with senior leaders in that country. The United States has been going over and investing in China for decades. Factories have been rebuilt from the ground up and we have employed tens of thousands of Chinese with American capital. Well, you know what, China is getting big enough. They can do that in America. The Japanese did that in the 1980s. We had major trade disputes with them. What

did they do? They started coming to our country and investing in our States with their capital, greenfield investments—auto factories, for example—and employing tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of Americans. We would welcome that. As a matter of fact, in Alaska, the Chinese are talking about helping us develop a large-scale Alaska natural gas project. Greenfield investment, employing Alaskans would be positive if that is going to happen. So that is the way we need to think about reciprocity.

The second key principle is allies—*allies, allies, allies*. The United States is an ally-rich nation. Our adversaries and potential adversaries—think about whom that might be: Russia, North Korea, Iran, potentially China. They are ally-poor. No one wants to join the North Korea team or the Iran team—well, maybe Syria—but the United States for decades has had allies because they trust us. We are not a perfect nation, but they trust us. Look all over the world.

So what we need to do with regard to our strategy on China is make sure we remember not only our allies and deepen current relationships with Japan, with Korea, with Australia, but expand them—Vietnam. The Presiding Officer and I went to Vietnam with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, a war hero who spent time in prison in Vietnam, Senator MCCAIN. The Vietnamese are very interested in doing more with us. India, there are incredible opportunities to have a deeper alliance between the oldest democracy in the world, us, and the biggest democracy in the world, them. So allies have to be a key part of our strategy as we look at how we deal with the rise of China for the next two or three or four or five decades because all of these countries—all of our allies—are having the same challenges.

Finally, the third principle we cannot lose sight of—and for too long this body lost sight of it—is robust American economic growth. Since the founding of our Nation, we have been growing at about 3 or 4 percent GDP growth. I have a chart, and I talk about it all the time down here. Yet, over the last decade, because of policies we inflicted on the American people, we were barely growing at 1-percent GDP growth. What does that mean? Everybody talks about numbers, wonky. That is a proxy for the American dream, and we were not growing. We weren't growing. In Asia, the coin of the realm of power more than anything—more than military power—is the power of your economy, and we have not had that. We have not shown up, and that matters.

What we are trying to do in this body now—tax reform, regulatory reform, unleashing American energy—is we are going to start growing this economy again, and that is going to help the American people, that is going to reignite the American dream, but that is going to be key with any policy we deal with China.

So as we are thinking through this challenge—and I am going to talk about this a lot, and I know all my colleagues are interested in this. I know my colleague from Michigan is interested in it—we need to continue to focus on these core principles—reciprocity, our allies, and robust economic growth as we all struggle with and put together a long-term strategy to deal with the rise of China, the challenges and the opportunities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, our Nation's middle class was built by the hard work of American workers. At a time when our country has become increasingly polarized, we should all be able to agree that everybody should have a fair chance to succeed if they are willing to work hard and play by the rules.

These truly American values have inspired generations of workers who stand together and collectively bargain for basic workplace protections such as fair wages, safe workplaces, and reasonable hours. These protections allow American workers and their families to be productive members of the economy and achieve their version of the American dream, but the American dream only exists if hard work is rewarded with the opportunity to earn a good living, provide for your loved ones, and, when it is all said and done, be able to retire with dignity.

This is deeply personal to me. As a nurse's aide, my mother found opportunity and led the effort to organize her workplace. She went on to serve as an SEIU union steward.

Unfortunately, in the years since I grew up in Rochester Hills, it feels as though the American dream has moved out of the reach for too many American families. Joining or staying in the middle class can be a daily struggle.

We must fight every day to support and build the middle class, not chip away at fundamental worker rights. The laws, regulations, and administrative decisions that come out of Washington have a direct impact on American workers, unions, and the middle class.

The National Labor Relations Board plays a central role in protecting the rights of American workers. The NLRB was created to safeguard their ability to unionize and engage in collective bargaining for fair workplace conditions.

To work as intended, the NLRB must be made up of members deeply committed to representing the interests of American workers. Unfortunately, the nominee we will be considering shortly, Mr. John Ring, does not share this commitment. In fact, he is the third labor attorney President Trump has nominated to the committee with zero—let me say that again—zero track record of representing workers. He has only represented clients on the corporate and management side of labor issues.

During Mr. Ring's tenure at one of the country's largest firms, he advised corporations on how to undermine worker protections. He also posted blogs opposing commonsense reforms to modernize union election procedures, classifying the NLRB actions as "some of the biggest assaults on employer rights in recent history."

Mr. Ring would join recently confirmed Board member William Emanuel, who quickly ran into ethics trouble based on his history of representing corporations. Just 5 months after Mr. Emanuel's appointment, the NLRB was forced to vacate a major decision related to employer liability due to his conflicts of interest. Yet the administration continues full steam ahead with new nominees with extensive corporate ties and conflicts of interest.

This administration is also breaking precedent and all conception of fairness by refusing to nominate new NLRB members in bipartisan pairs. Despite a pending Democratic vacancy on the panel, the President and Senate majority leader have instead chosen a partisan approach—doubling down on the one-sided nature of a supposedly independent Federal agency. This is simply an unacceptable development, and it is an ongoing effort to silence our Nation's workers. Protecting American workers, the American middle class, and the American dream should not be a partisan issue.

I am deeply concerned with Mr. Ring's appointment to the NLRB. If confirmed to the five-member Board, the voting majority of an agency charged with protecting workers' voices will be stacked with members who are focused on undermining fundamental worker rights. I think employers should be treated fairly but not at the expense of our Nation's workers and the American middle class. We need a balanced and fair NLRB, and we need NLRB members who will stick up for American workers and the middle class. Mr. Ring will not be that kind of NLRB member. The administration and the majority are actively preventing seating someone who will stand up for workers.

I will be voting against Mr. Ring's confirmation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Ring nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeben	Rubio
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Hassan	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Jones	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Harris	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Duckworth McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor.

Mitch McConnell, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, John Thune, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, Michael B. Enzi, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Tim Scott, James M. Inhofe, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. TILLIS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Hassan	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Jones	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Harris	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Duckworth McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 48.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

NOMINATION OF MIKE POMPEO

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor as we, as Americans, continue to see the regular reminders that the world is a very dangerous place. The horrendous reports out of Syria over the weekend show us there are leaders in the world who will test the rules that define civilized nations. They will exploit any crack that they see in our resolve.

President Trump has consistently responded to these kinds of challenges by showing that he is resolute and that he is unshakable. He has a foreign policy

that always puts America first. To continue to do this, the President needs to have a full national security team on the job and working for America. The Secretary of State is a very important part of that team.

Tomorrow, the Foreign Relations Committee is scheduled to have a hearing on Mike Pompeo's nomination to do this very important job. Mike Pompeo understands that if we want safety and security at home, we need a world that is peaceful and stable. I expect he is going to talk about all of these things at the confirmation hearing, and I look forward to his testimony.

We have all heard about Mike Pompeo's impressive qualifications for the job to which he has been nominated—first in his class at West Point; Harvard Law School; a Member of Congress; and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. He has the integrity, and he has the experience to serve as America's Secretary of State. As a former Member of Congress, he certainly understands how policy decisions get made and the key importance of congressional oversight. As head of the CIA, he clearly understands the crucial role that the intelligence community plays in preserving America's national security. As a soldier, he understands the consequences of decisions that get made in Washington, DC.

I have traveled with Mike Pompeo to meet with world leaders and to attend national security conferences. He knows the issues, and he knows the people. He is the right person for this job. I met with him just last month after he was nominated. We talked about some of the specific issues going on around the world and how they affect our Nation's national security. It was a very good conversation, and I am extremely confident that he is the right person for this job.

I expect many more people will come away from these hearings tomorrow with great confidence in Mike Pompeo. He will be an excellent representative for our Nation, and he will be a strong hand to implement President Trump's foreign policy. So I look forward to voting on this nomination as soon as possible after the hearings.

It was just a little over a year ago that he was confirmed by a very large, bipartisan majority for his current job as the CIA Director. It was right here on this Senate floor where that confirmation occurred. Fifteen Senators from the other side of the aisle agreed that Mike Pompeo was the right choice for that position. As the nominee for the job he now holds, he drew bipartisan praise for his qualifications. Two Democratic Senators actually came to the floor and spoke in favor of his nomination—Senators FEINSTEIN and WARNER. They are the current vice chair of the Intelligence Committee and the former chair of the Intelligence Committee. Since that time, Mike Pompeo has done an excellent job at the CIA. Even Hillary Clinton has come out and

praised his time in heading that Agency.

I expect that this can be a short process to confirm him in the new job for which he has been nominated, that of Secretary of State. There is certainly no good reason for Democrats to slow things down or to attempt to slow things down.

We need to restore America to a position we once held as the most powerful and respected Nation on the face of the Earth. For 8 years, the previous administration had us going in the wrong direction. The Obama administration followed a policy that it called strategic patience. That meant watching while the Assad regime in Syria crossed one redline after another. Then the redline became a green light. The result is that Syria continues to use chemical weapons today in attacking its own people. Strategic patience did not work.

The Obama administration's policy also meant that North Korea was allowed to get away with too much for far too long. North Korea continued to test nuclear weapons, continued to test missiles, and continued to use hostages as a way of getting what it wanted from other countries. Strategic patience did not work with North Korea.

The Trump administration has said very clearly that the era of strategic patience is over. The leaders of these countries need to understand that their belligerence will not succeed. They need to get the clear message that America has a new foreign policy. It is a policy to secure America's national interests and demonstrate America's leadership around the world. Part of this leadership is to stand up to show that there is a limit to the patience of the civilized countries of the world. The previous administration too often placed international opinion ahead of what was actually best for America. That only made the world a more dangerous place. The Trump administration has begun to get us back on the right track, and Mike Pompeo will ensure that we stay on the right track.

When it comes to issues like the upcoming discussions with North Korea, Mike Pompeo understands the risks of dealing with these kinds of aggressive adversaries. He also understands the opportunities that we now have because of President Trump's forceful stand for American interests.

Democrats should commit to allowing this nomination to move as quickly as possible. We will have a hearing tomorrow. We need to have a thorough discussion about what is happening around the world, and then we need to vote. Let's not have any more of the deliberate delays that we have been seeing by the Democrats in this body—no more pointless and partisan obstruction.

America's adversaries around the world are watching closely—in Russia, in Syria, in North Korea, in Iran, and in other places. It is time for us to show that we are serious about maintaining a strong foreign policy that

puts America first. President Trump is doing his part. Mike Pompeo is ready to do his part in his job. It is now time for the Senate to do our job.

Thank you.

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. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAIR HOUSING ACT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, 50 years ago today, Congress enacted the Fair Housing Act, exactly 1 week after the assassination of Martin Luther King as he fought for economic justice for sanitation workers in Memphis. It also came just weeks after the Kerner Commission issued its report on the origins of urban unrest in the 1960s. This report contained the now famous warning that “our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal.”

In the wake of these events, the Fair Housing Act made discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of housing illegal for the first time. For generations, redlining, restrictive covenants, and outright discrimination kept families of color locked out of entire neighborhoods, often far from where jobs were, and they created segregated communities that linger to this day. They denied these families the opportunity to build wealth through home ownership. Many of these exclusionary practices were carried out by private entities and local governments. But as Richard Rothstein reminds us in his new book, “The Color of Law”—and I recommend to everybody listening that they read that book—Federal policies also played a significant role in reinforcing segregation.

From 1934 through 1962—30 years, three decades—98 percent of all FHA mortgages went to White homeowners. In a country that in those days was about 10 percent African American, 98 percent of mortgages went to White homeowners. The Fair Housing Act made this despicable discrimination illegal. It required that Federal housing and urban development grants be administered in a way that would “affirmatively further” fair housing—not in a reactive way but in a way that would affirmatively further fair housing. State and local governments and public housing authorities were required to use their Federal funds in ways that would reverse, rather than accelerate or reinforce, segregation in their communities.

April 11, 1968, however, was not the end of our work to ensure fair housing and equal opportunities. Fifty years later, we haven’t had the progress we should have had, and so much more needs to be done.

A new report this year from the Center for Investigative Reporting analyzed tens of millions of mortgage records and found that all across the country people of color are far more likely—even holding constant for economic situations—to be turned down for a loan, taking into account factors like their income and the size of the loan. We know that the 2008 housing crisis hit communities of color particularly hard.

In the run-up to the crisis, faulty mortgages were targeted to people of color. Even those who qualified for a no-frills, no-surprises prime mortgage were often instead steered into a subprime, much riskier loan. Even African-American and Hispanic borrowers with higher incomes than other borrowers found themselves in risky, subprime, designed-to-fail products. These practices of discrimination stripped a generation’s worth of equity from communities that had fought hard for equal access to home ownership.

I know in my community in Cleveland, on the southeast side of Cleveland in the Broadway, Harvard area of that community, so much wealth has been lost. As people finally began to gain in home ownership and in wealth accumulation, what happened in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 devastated these communities. As a number of my colleagues have heard me say, in my ZIP Code of 44105, in Cleveland, OH, in the first half of 2007, there were more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States of America.

The household wealth of communities of color still hasn’t recovered. My neighborhood hasn’t, my community hasn’t, and my State hasn’t. Middle-class Black and Hispanic families lost half their wealth from 2007 to 2013—half their wealth. Middle-income Black household wealth was \$63,000 in 2007. A decade later, it was \$38,000. The numbers are similar for Hispanic households—\$85,000 down to \$46,000.

Borrowers with these higher cost loans were foreclosed on at about triple the rate of borrowers with standard, 30-year, fixed-rate mortgages. Over a recent 8-year period, 9.3 million homeowners lost their homes through foreclosure, distress sales, or surrendering their home to the lender.

After the crisis, we took steps to fight this discrimination. We created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to look after bank customers and to help root out discrimination. We required lenders to report more detailed data so that we can more easily spot modern-day redlining.

In 2015, HUD also issued the affirmatively furthering fair housing rule. This rule would have given clearer guidelines to communities to help them assess their own fair housing needs and provided them with the data they needed to inform their decisions. It would have allowed them to set their own goals and timelines.

Some of the questions communities would ask during these assessments

would demand they think in new ways about how to create housing and economic opportunities for all of their residents—no matter their color, no matter family size, no matter their disability if they have one. These are the types of questions this body told the country to ask when it enacted the fair housing bill five decades ago.

But instead of recommitting ourselves to the promise we made 50 years ago, too many Washington politicians are trying to take us backward. Earlier this year, HUD suspended implementing the affirmatively furthering fair housing rule. That will not reverse the requirements of the Fair Housing Act. Instead, it hurts communities, which will once again be left to comply with the law without the technical assistance they need.

Remember that new data that banks were going to report to make it easier to spot lenders who discriminate? The bill the Senate passed last month right here would exempt 85 percent of banks from reporting the data they are collecting and reporting today. So we are not even going to know what happened. This body has scaled back the amount of data we are trying to gather to stop discrimination. Without it, we can’t monitor trends in mortgage lending. It will be harder to see who has access to affordable mortgage credit and, importantly, who does not have access.

HUD is even thinking about changing its mission statement in ways that diminish the importance of combating housing discrimination. The administration’s actions over the past year make it clear they are already wavering in that commitment. For example, in 2017, HUD withdrew guidance requiring equal access for transgender people in homeless shelters. Let’s pick on them even more. According to a report in the New York Times, Dr. Carson’s HUD has suspended several anti-discrimination investigations, including an investigation of discriminatory housing advertisements on Facebook. The administration proposed a 14-percent cut to the HUD budget, including affordable housing and community development programs aimed at creating housing and opportunity for low-income communities.

We know that one-fourth of renters in this country spend at least 50 percent of their income on housing. If one thing goes wrong in their lives, they are evicted or they lose their homes. One-fourth of people in this country who rent are paying at least half their income in housing costs. In Cuyahoga County, the second most populous county in Ohio, one-fourth of all family units, one-fourth of all residents, homeowners or renters, spend one-half of their income on housing, so it is not just renters, but it is often homeowners too.

We are deciding in this body because the President wants to—the far right in this body wants to cut spending on housing even more. We have enough money to do a huge tax cut for the

richest people in the country. The richest 1 percent will get 81 percent of that tax cut. I was talking to an accountant the other day in Elyria, OH. It is tax season, of course, and he is busy. He said: When people come and see me, they ask inevitably when I am doing their taxes "Well, how does this tax bill affect me?"

He asks: Are you a billionaire?

They laugh and say: Of course not.

He then says: Well, only if you are a billionaire will it affect you, and then you will save millions of dollars on your taxes.

That is a bit of an exaggeration, but that is what that tax bill is all about. So if you are a billionaire, if you are a decamillionaire, if you made a million dollars last year, you are going to save a whole lot on your taxes this year. But if you are living in working-class housing, if you can't afford much more than the very basic kind of housing or even worse than that, you are going to see your budget cut. You are going to see fewer vouchers. You are going to see less funding for housing.

What kind of government is this, this mean-spiritedness? There are more tax cuts for the richest in this country, but let's stick it to people who are barely making it. These are people who make \$10 to \$12 an hour. They make \$10 to \$12 an hour, and we are going to cut their Medicaid. They are making \$10 to \$12 an hour, and we are going to scale back their SNAP benefits. They are making \$10 to \$12 an hour, and we are going to undermine their housing subsidies. What is all of that about in this new government that we are living in now?

The last thing we ought to do at a time when a quarter of all renter households—400,000 families in my State of almost 12 million, 400,000 families pay half of their income in housing costs. Again, if one thing goes wrong, if their car breaks down going to work, could they come up with \$500 to fix their car? Probably not. Then what happens? Then they are evicted, and then everything goes upside down because they can't pay their rent, so they get evicted. The kid has to go to a new school district. They lose most of the things they have. They have to find a place to live. They probably don't have the money for the downpayment that a landlord charges.

A few years ago, I hosted a discussion with some of my colleagues and invited Matthew Desmond, the author of the book "Evicted." In the front of the book, he scribbled the phrase "Home = Life." If you don't have decent housing, it is pretty hard to put a stable life together for you and your family. One of the things he said in that book is that when you get your paycheck every 2 weeks or once a month, the rent eats first. You have to pay your rent. If you can't afford to pay your rent or you can barely afford to pay your rent, you can't do much else. That simple statement captures so much—a safe, stable home is the foundation for opportunities.

This government is going to give tax cuts to the richest people in the country, and we are pulling the rug out from under people who are working every bit as hard as we do in this body—and many of them work harder than we do—just trying to get along on \$8 or \$10 or \$12 an hour. We are denying people the opportunity of living in a safe, stable home. That is why we must redouble our commitment to fair housing. That is why we must take real, proactive steps.

My colleagues and I have legislation, the Fair and Equal Housing Act of 2017, that would add gender identity and sexual orientation to those protected from discrimination under the Fair Housing Act. Rather than take us backward, we must take these sorts of actions to give more Americans the opportunity to have a safe, stable home and to build wealth through home ownership. We must constantly work toward Dr. King's vision—killed 50 years ago this month—of equality and equal opportunity for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

NOMINATION OF ANDREW WHEELER

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak today about the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to be the Deputy Administrator of the EPA—an extremely important position.

Mr. Wheeler's expertise and experience make him extraordinarily qualified to become the Deputy Administrator. I am a little biased when it comes to Mr. Wheeler because he has great family roots in the State of West Virginia, which, to me, is a good recommendation in and of itself. I think his wealth of knowledge over the years working on environmental policy in the public and in the private sectors is just incredible. His knowledge and experience will be a tremendous asset to the Agency and to the American people. He understands—watching policy being made and helping policy being made himself but also then transitioning to the private sector and watching how that policy then influences the private sector as well. He has had an active hand in significant environmental—energy—and infrastructure policy achievements and debates and probably some of the failures that we have had, as well as the confirmation of numerous Presidential nominees. So Andrew will have a head start. He will hit the ground running, and that is what we need at the EPA.

Andrew was also tasked with coordinating and working with the various agencies within the committee's jurisdiction. Most importantly, he has been and was tasked with this, so he worked with other agencies while he was a staffer.

Beginning in 2009, Mr. Wheeler went into the private sector, continuing his work in environmental and energy policy. Throughout his career, he has worked with individuals and stake-

holders who run the political gamut, and he has left a very positive impression on them.

During his confirmation hearing in our EPW Committee, he was very forthright in his answers, very willing to look deeper into certain areas, and very willing to not express an opinion if he didn't really know or was unsure of some of the details. Actually, I think he exhibited a real curiosity as to how he could make the EPA run smoother and better and be more reflective of what the President and we here in the Senate and people across this country see as a vision for the EPA.

I have also been impressed by the number of individuals who know Mr. Wheeler and who have come forward and spoken about his expertise and his willingness to collaborate on issues all across the country. He has had an active role in my State of West Virginia, which is a high energy-producing State.

I urge my colleagues to vote to confirm Mr. Wheeler. They will have no regret. I look forward to working with him at the EPA on issues that are important to my State of West Virginia and across the country.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

TAX REFORM AND GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, over the last couple of weeks, many of us have had an opportunity to spend more time at home than we do just going back and forth a few days a week.

While I was there, I had the opportunity to talk to small business owners, employees—people who are seeing their paychecks for the first time reflecting what we have done with the tax bill. Both in my hometown of Springfield, MO, and around our State, I also heard a level of optimism that was very encouraging.

One of the people I talked to was on the national board of manufacturers. A recent poll of the manufacturers looking at their confidence level reflected that it was the highest it has ever been in all of the time they have been polling on how they see the future.

Mr. President, where you and I live, in an economy that makes things and grows things, we always do better. We are a productive part of the country. We don't do quite as well in an advice economy, but we are not opposed to an advice-giving economy. We have people who give advice. But, frankly, if you put that on top of truly productive capacity and a marketplace that meets that capacity, we always do very well.

As I talked to people, I heard consistently two reasons that people feel their optimism is justified and understandably growing. One reason is the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. No matter what was said about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, people who were told it wouldn't help them are finding out, when they get their first paychecks, that it is helping them. People who were told that the

investment opportunities that would encourage them to grow their small businesses wouldn't be there for them are finding out that they are there for them, and they see those things coming. The economy is generally seeing money stay where we live that otherwise would have gone to Washington, DC. Forty-three different entities have come to our offices with ideas about what they are doing.

The 53,000 State employees in our State—the payroll deduction would indicate that this year, \$32½ million from just that group of employees that was sent to Washington, DC, last year—it will stay in Missouri this year.

I mentioned on the floor not too long ago that one of our counties had reported that their county payroll—that the average county employee would take home \$1,800 more this year, with the same paycheck to start with. That is beyond what they would have taken home last year. For all of those county employees put together, in Boone County, MO, it would mean that \$946,000 will stay in Boone County that previously would have gone to Washington, DC. That makes a difference in the economy of the county because there are a lot of other people beyond those 485 employees who see the same kinds of things happening to them, but it really makes a difference for families. That take-home pay difference that some people here in the Senate and other places in this building would suggest won't matter to families—it turns out it matters a lot. And I will say again that it particularly matters a lot if you don't have it. If you have all kinds of money, it is easy to say: Well, \$200 a month—what difference does that make? Let me assure you, it makes a difference if you don't have it. Lots of families and individuals are beginning to see the ability to do more things with their own money.

The second thing I consistently heard about was just the difference in the regulation atmosphere. Earlier this week, a dozen Federal agencies came together in an effort to improve the environmental review process to allow infrastructure projects to go on more quickly—not only to diminish the time it takes to get a project started but also to be able to, with more certainty, go out and start the process of bidding and acquiring and the things you need to do to make that happen.

There were a dozen Federal agencies working together with a common purpose, asking: What can we do to make this system work better? We have had up to 29 statutes and 5 Executive orders that resulted in a number of different decisions under Federal law that allow those projects to move forward more quickly.

We had a discussion in the Commerce Committee this morning with one of the nominees for the Surface Transportation Board who had been instrumental in helping put together a more streamlined way to get things done if, for instance, you were putting some-

thing back exactly where it had been. It makes sense to everybody in America that if you are building a bridge where there was a bridge, it should take less of an environmental impact study than if you are building a bridge where there has never been a bridge before. But until right now, those two things were not treated in a significantly different way; they were treated in the same way. Now, because of legislation that we passed and the President signed, they will be treated in a different way, as they should have been.

Location is a great advantage to our whole country. Again, in the middle of the country, where I live, I have seen—I think it may be our greatest competitive advantage—access not only to the national marketplace but to the world marketplace. Generally, we have the same things in America. Things that allow us to put infrastructure in place more readily and make it more affordable to get it done in a quicker way are all good things.

This week, one of the nominees we will be voting on is the Deputy Administrator for the Environmental Protection Agency. Over the last decade, based on their own estimate, the Environmental Protection Agency imposed somewhere between \$43 and \$51 billion in regulatory costs annually. You have to be an incredibly strong economy to absorb another \$50 billion in regulatory costs from one agency. And that is their estimate; you could get other estimates that say: Oh, no, it is going to be a lot more costly than that. These are the costs they are willing to admit to.

The current administration has turned the page. I hope that the new Deputy Administrator becomes an active part of that. I think the EPA has been on the forefront of really looking at the kinds of things that are holding back the economy and trying to do things that make sense.

The EPA Administrator, Administrator Pruitt, quickly got on the job of dismantling two of the most costly and burdensome regulations that may have ever been proposed by any Federal agency. One is the waters of the United States, where the EPA decided that virtually all of the water in the country was somehow related to navigable water. Some of it might eventually run into navigable water, but the law says that the EPA has the authority to regulate navigable water.

The EPA said: Oh, no, that means any water that could ever run into any water that could ever run into any water that could ever run into navigable water.

In our State, that meant that 99.7 percent of the State would have been under the EPA authority, if they wanted to exercise it, for things that would have slowed down the economy, made it harder to resurface your driveway or dig a utility pole or put fertilizer on your field or get a building permit.

It was a ridiculous proposal, and Administrator Pruitt and the EPA under-

stood that it is ridiculous—just as, by the way, the courts did. The reason this had not gone into effect yet is largely because the courts basically said to the EPA, in many instances: You don't have the authority to do that. This change was made because the EPA realized that they didn't have the authority. Frankly, if they did have the authority, it would have been a bad idea.

There was a power plan that would have been so excessive that, in the State where I live, the utility bill would have doubled in about 10 or 12 years—a power plan that would have added up to \$39 billion in compliance costs, every single penny of which would have been passed along in your utility bill and mine, all of it added to the utility bill in ways that just, frankly, didn't make sense.

The EPA has moved away from that but not away from the idea of regulation or environmental control. In fact, Administrator Pruitt came to the Thomas Hill Energy Center in our State in April of last year to hear directly from workers, from the electric co-op members that provide electricity to many of our rural residents, and from ag leaders about the impact of that. He listened to that and went back—I am sure he did that in other places—and withdrew that rule but at the same time proposed a solution for West Lake Landfill, which has been on the critical “we need to take care of this” list for 30 years.

The job of the EPA is not to strangle the economy. The job of the EPA is to make the environment more protected by doing the things that the EPA was designed to do. I think that is what they have been doing—looking at the rules that don't make sense, trying to be sure that we don't do things at the Federal level that cost people their jobs, their livelihood, and their opportunities for no reason at all.

I had a meeting this week—it was Friday a week ago—at the Missouri State University, where the head of the Missouri Department of Agriculture, Chris Chinn, and the Missouri Farm Bureau president, Blake Hurst, and I answered questions for about 45 minutes from a crowd there to talk about agriculture and the future of agriculture. Not a single question was asked about the farm bill. The questions were basically about trade, rural broadband, and regulation. I think you could go to lots of other places and say: What do you want to talk about that you are most concerned about with the Federal Government, and two or three of those topics would come up again.

Last year the Senate used the Congressional Review Act to block 15 new major rules that had come up late in the previous administration. That act had been used exactly one time since it was put into law, in 1995 or 1996. It had been used exactly one time during the entire life of the law until we were able to look at it and use it 15 times last year to eliminate rules that would

have cost our economy \$36 billion in compliance costs. They were not rules that we had before. In the case of the last administration, the country had gone along without these rules even being proposed for 7½ years but, suddenly, on the way out the door, there were all these new things that would have held the economy back in a way that, frankly, nobody would want to have to do if they were still there to take responsibility for it. So we are looking at what we can do in regulation, looking at what we can do in transportation, looking at what we can do to make us more competitive and allow things to happen so the taxpayers have the benefit of a process that works for them instead of a process that works with them.

Rolling back unnecessary redtape isn't just important for infrastructure. It isn't just important for individuals. It is also important for strengthening our economy. I think we are seeing that happen. These people who are willing to serve, like some of the individuals we will be voting on this week, are people who are willing to give of themselves and their time, their effort, and their energy to work for the citizens of our country. We should be grateful to them, but we should also be sure that we are watching carefully to be sure that they continue to do the kinds of things that create opportunity and competition.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. TOOMEY assumed the Chair.)

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, it was about 2 weeks ago that I had the opportunity to tour a steel plant in Redding, PA. The plant is owned by Carpenter Technology. It is a company that was founded in 1889. It is quite extraordinary. It is a vast complex in Redding, PA. They have 2,000 employees in Berks County, which is where Redding is located, and they have an additional 1,200 or so folks throughout other parts of Pennsylvania.

Carpenter Technology is a leading producer and distributor of specialty metals, including what they call soft magnetics. As I understand it, soft magnetics increase the efficiency and the power and the battery life of electric motors. That is one of the main applications of these soft magnetics. It is a feature in steel and other metals that allows the magnetic properties to be turned on and off very rapidly. It is an amazing technology. It is an absolutely essential component for all kinds of products, including aircrafts, electric cars, even medical devices. It

is quite a range of products. One of the things I learned, of the many things I learned while I was at Carpenter Technology, is that tax reform is working for Carpenter Technology.

While I was there, the CEO announced a \$100 million investment, right there in Redding, Berks County, PA, to upgrade their capabilities and their capacity to produce these soft magnetics. To be more precise, they are buying an entire new hot rolling steel mill in Redding, PA. It is a \$100 million investment in a new mill that will allow them to expand their output and meet increasing demand for this really fascinating product that they make.

One of the things the leadership of Carpenter Technology made abundantly clear in their press release and in their public statements was that they were able to purchase this mill and make this \$100 million investment in their company now because of the tax reform we passed. This is exactly the type of capital investment we envisioned when we passed the tax reform bill. It was exactly for this kind of economic activity and expansion that we wanted to lower the cost of deploying this capital and expanding business and generate the economic growth and prosperity that comes with this.

By the way, Carpenter Technology is not an outlier. This kind of investment is consistent with the sentiment we are seeing all across the country.

Just at the end of the first quarter—the quarter that just ended—there was a large survey of American chief financial officers—CFOs—across the country. It was carried out by Deloitte LLP. It was exploring the question of growth expectations for capital expenditure. The fact is, their conclusion is that these CFOs anticipate greater growth and more hiring. In fact, the sentiment is at a multiyear high. Why is that? Here is what Deloitte had to say about it:

Clearly, there's a high desire for investment in the U.S., and that is coming from just the structure of tax reform. [CFOs] are expecting higher domestic wages, almost 40 percent are anticipating and planning for higher and front-loaded capital investments, and about a third higher research and development. What they've said is because of tax reform they're going to take those actions.

It is very straightforward. It is very clear.

So here we are, just 3½ months since passage, and the tax bill has already and continues to benefit workers and businesses, and, boy, these are not the crumbs some of our friends on the other side of the aisle have tried to suggest they are. There are over 500 businesses that we know of—businesses that are sufficiently high profile that we have read about and we can track their announcements. These 500-plus businesses employ over 4 million workers. Over 4 million workers across America have already received bonuses, wage increases, enhanced benefits, and increased contributions to their pension plans. It has already hap-

pened, and it is attributable entirely to the tax reform. So the benefits from this tax reform are clearly already flowing to the very workers we intended to benefit from it.

So my friends on the other side have had some struggles in thinking about how they can disparage this tax reform. They have come to realize that calling \$1,000 bonuses and multi-thousand-dollar pay raises crumbs is probably not such a good idea. So they have shifted the argument to be a kind of class warfare argument.

I hear two varieties of this most frequently. One is this idea that, well, the benefits all flow to the rich. The second is this idea that, well, these are greedy corporations that get this tax savings, and they just use the money to buy stock back.

Let's unpack this a little bit. What about this argument that it all flows to the rich? Well, there is one problem with that argument. That problem is it is not true; it is not true at all because when we did this tax reform, we did it in a way that makes the Tax Code more progressive. What does that mean? That means that upper income Americans—the wealthiest Americans—have an increased percentage of the total tax burden. So while everybody gets a savings in percentage terms, the savings disproportionately go to lower and middle-income workers and a disproportionately small amount of the savings go to upper income workers. So when the dust clears, the net effect is wealthier people are paying a larger percentage of the total tax bill than they paid beforehand.

So, clearly, the benefits of this tax reform are flowing to everyone and disproportionately to low- and middle-income people.

What about this idea that stock buybacks are such a terrible thing? There have been some stock buybacks. What does that mean? That means companies have taken the additional pretax cash flow they have, and they have decided in some cases that they will take a portion of it and return it to the owners of the company.

It just so happens that about 40 percent of the owners of the public companies in America are the people who have saved in their retirement plans—401(k) plans, IRA savings accounts, 529 plans, defined benefit pension plans. These are middle-income Americans whose savings are invested in the stocks of companies.

In some cases, yes, there have been stock buybacks. That means these savers have had cash introduced into their accounts, which then can be deployed by the managers of these accounts into new investments, which is what happens for anyone who is selling their stock in response to a buyback. They get cash.

What do they do with that cash? They get the chance to reassess where they invest their money, making new

investments, making different investments, reallocating capital, and shifting capital to where there is the greatest demand for it. This is exactly the way a free enterprise system should work. This is exactly the mechanism that allows capital to flow to its highest use and helps to encourage still more economic growth.

Better still, this is just the beginning. We are only 3½ months into this. We haven't yet even begun to reap the benefits—as a country, as a society—of this reformed Tax Code. Businesses are already responding to the incentives, and with the lower after-tax cost of capital we have created, we are seeing increased investment. Whether it is a tractor or a new factory or a piece of machinery or a steel mill in Redding, PA, that investment invariably requires workers to produce that investment, so there is greater job security and more opportunities for those workers. But then the company that actually deploys that investment, such as Carpenter Technology in the case I just mentioned—their workers become more productive; their workers have new tools that allow them to command higher wages and a better standard of living. That is what is happening, and that is going to continue to develop as companies are just now beginning to have the opportunity to deploy that capital only 3½ months into this new tax regime.

I am just delighted that every week that goes by, I learn about more Pennsylvania workers and more American workers who are working for businesses that are benefiting and enhancing their investments. It is a really good-news story.

Now I will shift a little bit to the CBO report that came out earlier this week, which said a few things worth noting. One should be on all of our radars, and that is the fiscal challenge we face. We have too much debt, and that number is growing too rapidly.

This fiscal year, the gross amount of Federal debt is \$21 trillion. By the end of this 10-year window, CBO contemplates that number will go up to \$33 trillion. This is a huge problem. But I think it is important that we stress where this problem comes from. This is a spending problem; this is not a revenue problem, and we can see this in CBO numbers.

In June of last year, almost a year ago, CBO projected that over the 10-year window they were considering at the time, we would have \$43 trillion of tax revenues flowing into the Federal Government, with \$53 trillion of spending—a net deficit over that period of \$10 trillion.

One year later, CBO has updated its projections, and now it is calling for \$44 trillion in revenue over the current 10-year window. So there will be \$1 trillion more in revenue, but \$56 trillion in spending—\$3 trillion more in spending. So we go from a 10-year window that looks as though the CBO is projecting a \$10 trillion deficit to a \$12 trillion

deficit. Clearly the deficit is growing, and clearly it is driven by the increase in spending.

The bottom line is, whether it is \$10 trillion or \$12 trillion, this deficit is way too big. But tax reform is going to enhance the revenue collected by the Federal Government by helping us create a larger economy to tax. The spending is our fault. That is something we have to get under control.

CBO has observed a couple of other things. They talk about our tax reform, and they talk about terrific things. They say in the report that the tax reform results in “higher levels of investment, employment, and GDP.” We can see dramatically different projections of economic growth post-tax reform, according to the CBO, than we had pre-tax reform, according to the CBO.

In January of 2017, they projected that this year the economy would grow 2 percent. But after tax reform passed, they reassessed this year. They took the projection of 2 percent for this year, and they said that now it will grow 3 percent based on tax reform. That is a 50-percent increase in the growth of our economy. That is huge.

For next year, 2019, they were projecting 1.7 percent growth. Now, post-tax reform, they are estimating 2.9 percent growth—1.2 percentage points—again, an almost 50-percent increase. These are huge increases, and they explain it. They say: “The largest effects on GDP over the decade stem from the tax act . . . boost[ing] the level of real GDP by an average of 0.7 percent . . . over the 2018–2028 period.”

The fact is, this tax bill is already working. It is making the structural changes in the Tax Code that create a greater incentive for businesses to invest. It is making American companies and American workers more competitive than we have been in a very, very long time. It is going to increase the capital stock, the invested assets in our businesses that allow our workers to become more productive, and it is going to continue to allow those more productive workers to earn higher wages.

Let's be honest. No one can prove with certainty what the future holds, so it is worth looking at what is happening in the present. As a result of our tax reform, what is happening today, what is happening in the present is this: Millions of Americans have been receiving bonuses; millions of Americans have been receiving pay raises; millions of Americans have seen increases in their pension contributions; millions of Americans have seen an increase in the value of their pensions; and millions of Americans—like the workers at Carpenter Technology—have seen greater job security and greater opportunity as their employers are investing in their companies, and that is already beneficial for all of us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, as my colleague from Pennsylvania has pointed out, the recently passed tax bill is already having a profound impact on the economy, and, as the Congressional Budget Office report points out, over the course of the next decade, it will significantly increase economic growth in the economy and increase the number of jobs. It said that over 1 million jobs would be created as a result of the passage of the tax bill.

To his point, as well, they talk about deficits and debt projected out into the future, which clearly are major issues but, again, I would point out, are a result of the rate of growth in spending and not of the impact of the revenues generated by lowering taxes because when you get greater growth in the economy, it means that more people are taking realizations and more people are paying taxes. The Congressional Budget Office, as a rule of thumb, suggests that for each percentage—a 1-percent increase in growth of the economy—you get about \$3 trillion in additional revenue over the course of a decade.

If we assume, and I believe we will—even the CBO, which I think is very conservative in terms of growth estimates, suggests that there is higher growth attributable largely to the changes we made in the Tax Code, reducing taxes on families in this country and reducing taxes on our small businesses, which incentivize them to expand and grow their operations and, therefore, create better paying jobs and higher wages, but also will generate more revenue coming in to the Federal coffers.

Clearly, the issue that we have in terms of the debt picture in the long term is not about revenue; it is about spending, which is growing dramatically over that next decade, particularly in what we refer to as mandatory spending or entitlement programs. This cries out, I would argue, for reforms in entitlement programs. But to say that somehow tax reform is contributing to that is a far cry from the truth, and I think the Congressional Budget Office numbers bear that out. Again, I would argue that in terms of what they suggest we are going to see in growth as a result of the changes we made in the Tax Code, I believe it is going to be dramatically understated.

When it came time to draft tax reform, Republicans really had two goals in mind. First, we wanted to put more money in the pockets of hard-working Americans, and we wanted to do that right away. Second, we wanted to create the kind of economy that would give Americans access to economic security for the long term.

Less than 4 months after we passed this bill, I am proud to report that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has already achieved the first goal and is well on its way to achieving the second.

To put more money in Americans' pockets, we lowered tax rates across the board for American families, nearly doubled the standard deduction, and

increased the child tax credit to \$2,000, doubling the amount that families can deduct per child in terms of the child tax credit.

In February, that relief started to show up in Americans' paychecks. According to Treasury Department estimates, 90 percent of the American people are seeing bigger paychecks this year, thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. And thanks to the IRS's new withholding calculator, families with children can adjust their withholding to take into account the individual tax relief provided in the new tax law, in particular, the increased child tax credit. That means even more in the paychecks of hard-working Americans without their having to wait until they file their 2018 tax returns next year.

When it came to our second goal, we knew that the only way to give Americans access to real long-term economic security was to ensure they had access to good jobs, good wages, and real opportunities. We knew that the only way to guarantee access to good jobs, wages, and opportunities was to make sure businesses had the ability to create them.

Before the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, our Tax Code wasn't helping businesses to create jobs or to increase opportunities for workers. In fact, it was doing the exact opposite. Large and small businesses were weighed down by high tax rates and growth-killing tax provisions, and all the regulatory and compliance burdens that came along with them.

Our outdated international tax rules left America's global businesses at a competitive disadvantage in the global economy. That had real consequences for American workers. A small business owner struggling to afford the annual tax bill for their business was highly unlikely to be able to hire a new worker or to raise wages. A larger business struggling to stay competitive in the global marketplace while paying substantially higher tax rates than its foreign competitors too often had limited funds to expand or increase its investment here in the United States.

When it came time for tax reform, we set out to improve the playing field for American workers by improving the playing field for businesses as well. To accomplish that, we lowered tax rates across the board for owners of small and medium-sized businesses, farms, and ranches. We lowered our Nation's massive corporate tax rate, which until January 1, was the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world. We expanded business owners' ability to recover investments they make in their businesses, which will free up cash that they can reinvest in their operations and their workers. We brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century by replacing our outdated worldwide system with a modernized territorial tax system so that American businesses are not operating at a disadvantage next to their foreign competitors.

The goal in all of this was to free up businesses to increase investments in the U.S. economy, hire new workers, and increase wages and benefits. I am happy to report that this is exactly what they are doing. Since tax reform became the law of the land, we have seen a steady drumbeat of businesses announcing good news for American workers. So far, more than 500 companies, and counting, have announced pay raises, bonuses, 401(k) match increases and other benefits, business expansions, and utility rate cuts: Starbucks, McDonald's, Jergens, McCormac & Company, Apple, Best Buy, Walmart, Bank of America, ExxonMobil, Hormel Foods, UPS, and American Express. And the list goes on and on.

I don't need to tell anyone that Americans had a tough time during the last administration or that our economy had stagnated. But under Republican leadership, we are finally starting to see the economy turn around, and tax reform is playing a very big part. Unfortunately, Democrats seem unable to accept the fact that tax reform is benefiting middle-class Americans. In fact, Democrats recently introduced an infrastructure plan that they want to pay for by repealing features of the tax law that are producing so many new benefits for American workers.

Republicans wanted Democrats to join us in the process of drafting tax reform. After all, a lot of the provisions in the final bill were the result of years of work by Republicans and Democrats. I was a part of that process. We had working groups that spent a good amount of time looking at every element and feature of the Tax Code—bipartisan groups of Republicans and Democrats, working together, making recommendations about things that we could do to reform our Tax Code in a way that would incentivize greater growth and expansion and better jobs and higher wages.

Democrats had previously expressed their support for things that became key parts of the bill, like lowering our Nation's massive corporate tax rate. Unfortunately, instead of working with us, Democrats chose to play politics. Apparently, it was more important to them to attempt to score political points against Republicans than to work on a bill that they knew had the potential to help the American people. Almost 4 months after the bill's passage, they are still playing politics, despite the fact that in the face of the bill's success, their attempts to criticize it are sounding pretty desperate.

Take their attempt to portray the bill's benefits for workers as "crumbs." Let me tell you that a worker whose salary just increased by \$3 an hour does not see that additional \$500 a month as crumbs, especially when you combine it with the rest of the tax relief in the new tax law. A worker who gets an increased match in her 401(k) account will see her retirement savings increase significantly as a result of the

Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and she will not see that benefit as crumbs.

It is too bad that Democrats can't accept the fact that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is working. At the very least, they should stop trying to undo the benefits that it is bringing to the American people. Over 500 companies across this country have announced increases in wages, increases in benefits, and bonuses—direct benefits to American workers, to the tune of over 5 million Americans who already have benefited from this. That is the short-term impact that we have seen already.

The American people spent long enough in a stagnant economy. It is time to get this economy jump-started and to see those wages and those good-paying jobs come back into this economy so that American families can benefit, can experience, and can enjoy a better standard of living, a higher quality of life, an opportunity to do more for their children, to help them with their college education, to set aside a little bit for retirement, and to take care of those day-to-day bills.

Fifty percent of the American people, according to polls, say they are living paycheck to paycheck. One thing we can do to help them is to make that paycheck bigger and, hopefully, to put them in a position where they can put aside a little bit for retirement and where, maybe, they can help save up for their kids' college education, and maybe take a vacation with the family.

There are so many ways in which the benefits of this bill are delivered to the American people and to American families and can help them in their daily lives. We shouldn't try and go back. We ought to try to go forward and recognize that the near-term benefits of this bill are very real to American workers. The long-term benefits are going to be, I think, even more beneficial to American workers, to American businesses, and to American families because not only now will they benefit from the lower tax rates that are delivered to the entire tax table, but they are also benefiting from the doubling of the standard deduction, the doubling of the child tax credit, and all the other benefits that are included in this bill. American businesses, small and large, are also seeing those benefits on a daily basis, so much so that they have already made these commitments to over 5 million Americans. That is 500 companies that are paying out bonuses, higher pay, and bigger benefits for their workers. That is only going to increase over time as this economy starts to take off because they now have an incentive to expand and grow their operations through reduced rates, when it comes both to large and small businesses, through the ability to recover their costs more quickly and to free up that capital with which they can invest in and expand and grow this economy and create those better paying jobs.

This is a win-win for the American people. It is a win-win for our country.

I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will quit referring to it as “crumbs” because I know the American people don’t see it that way.

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. MURRAY. 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. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to oppose in the strongest terms the nomination of Patrick Pizzella as Deputy Secretary of Labor.

With this nomination President Trump is once again breaking his promise to put workers first. Mr. Pizzella has a record that is time and again at odds with the goals of the very Department he would help to lead as Deputy Secretary. His track record is one of not merely failing workers but of failing to enforce laws to protect the health and safety of workers, seeking to diminish workers’ rights and protections, and undermining the unions that represent and fight for them.

In fact, his record includes working with convicted lobbyist Jack Abramoff on behalf of causes that are counter to the mission of the Department of Labor.

In the 1990s, Congress was moving to expand labor and immigration protections to the Northern Marianas Islands, a U.S. Territory, to end the operation of sweatshops that did not follow Federal labor laws. The law at the time let companies bring in foreign workers to toil under inhumane conditions. The workers were underpaid. They were forced to sign contracts signing away their rights to protest labor conditions, and some were even coerced to have abortions.

The companies operating under these inhumane conditions were able to print the words “Made in the U.S.A.” on their products.

While Congress was looking to take action to change the law so we could better protect workers, Pizzella was working with Abramoff to coordinate all-expense-paid trips for dozens of Republican lawmakers and staff and seeking to maintain the sweatshop status quo.

Patrick Pizzella chose not to work for workers but for corporations. These efforts are not just counter to the mission of the Department of Labor, they are counter to our national values.

The rest of Mr. Pizzella’s record shows that he has taken equally extreme positions throughout his career. Take, for example, his radical record as the sole employee of the Conservative Action Project, a far-right group funded by billionaire donors like the DeVos family, or his record when he last served in the Department of Labor. Under his leadership, the Department

of Labor cut its budget in part by cutting down its own employees’ collective bargaining rights and decreasing official time.

Then there is his long record championing anti-union policies and arguing to limit collective bargaining rights.

At the Federal Labor Relations Authority, Pizzella not only ruled consistently against workers and unions, but he repeatedly broke with longstanding policy by calling out the names of individual workers in his decisions. He chose to call out defendants by name and put them in the public spotlight. The pattern of Mr. Pizzella’s anti-worker ideology is clearly unchanged today. Throughout his career, Mr. Pizzella’s record has been alarmingly consistent. From his years serving as the right hand to Jack Abramoff until now, he has shown that he is not going to fight for workers. He will fight against them.

It would be irresponsible to put a man with such a strong track record of anti-worker conviction a tweet away from leading the Department of Labor. It is unconscionable that someone of Mr. Pizzella’s background would be the No. 2 leader at the Department of Labor. It is unacceptable that he could be in line to serve as Acting Secretary should Secretary Acosta leave the Department.

I strongly oppose his nomination. I will be voting against him, and I encourage our colleagues to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Colorado.

OPIOID CRISIS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, over the past couple of weeks Congress and the Senate had its State work period, and during that time we go back to our State and travel, listening to our constituents. I had the incredible opportunity to go to Colorado and spend time on the Front Range, on the I-25 Corridor, where the vast majority of the population of Colorado lives, and also spent some time in Western Colorado, which most people identify as being where they travel to Colorado, with the ski resorts, mountains, Rocky Mountain National Park, and the Great Sand Dunes National Park.

I also had a chance to visit some of the smaller communities in Southern Colorado, including an area known as the San Luis Valley, where some of the longest living Colorado families have farms. There are families and businesses.

The focus of this visit was about how we grow the economy in the San Luis Valley, the Eastern Plains, and the Western Slope—areas that haven’t seen as much economic growth as, perhaps, Denver, Fort Collins, or Colorado Springs.

I also wanted to spend some time getting into the community and talking about a couple of the issues they face when it comes to the opioid crisis that this country faces. Over the past sev-

eral years, a great deal of attention has been paid to prescription drug addiction and to prescription drug overdoses.

My home State of Colorado actually has an average that exceeds the national average when it comes to prescription addiction and overdose. We are losing a person in Colorado to drug overdose every 36 hours—far too many people. In our rural communities, it is not just the wealthy who are immune or the poor who are immune or the wealthy who are affected or the wealthy who are affected. It is everyone—wealthy, poor, low- and high-income. The opioid crisis and prescription drug addiction have affected every nook and cranny of our communities.

The attention that has been paid to the addiction crisis in this country has resulted in some of the greatest bipartisan achievements Congress has had over the past several years. The passage of the 21st Century Cures Act will expedite new treatment methods through the FDA and provide research treatment dollars for the opioid crisis and the prescription drug crisis and addiction.

It also led to passage of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, legislation that had great bipartisan support. People on both sides of the aisle worked on this legislation together to pass a bill to address what is happening to our communities.

Every single one of us has a story about somebody close to us, near to us, perhaps a friend or relative—probably both—who has fallen victim to prescription drug addiction and opioid addiction. Of course if you end up with a prescription drug addiction, that one pill might be \$60 or \$80, but you can go out on the streets and find heroin for \$10 to \$15. Now we see the rise of heroin replacing prescription drugs and you see the cycle. The drug dealers have figured out a way to lace cocaine with fentanyl so that it becomes a little bit more addictive and so people are hooked on cocaine more than they already are.

You know the dangers of fentanyl, a synthetic drug so powerful that you can’t have a dog sniff for it at the Post Office because it would kill the animal.

During these roundtables that were held in the San Luis Valley about opioids, I learned a couple of things. In Alamosa, CO, I learned that about 90 percent of the jail population in Alamosa is addicted to drugs. At the same roundtable, we talked about the challenges that rural communities have in treatment. We know that if a police officer or law enforcement officer or paramedic finds somebody who is overdosed and they are revived with Narcan, yes, you saved their life. You brought them back, but what happens after that? They are left to their own devices. Do they return to that abuse? Do they return to that cycle of overdose? Without treatment, yes, they will.

We learned in Swedish Medical Center Englewood, CO, the Front Range

suburb of Denver, that 1 out of every 10 visitors to the emergency room of people who are revived by Narcan or some other treatment after an overdose will be dead within a year. So 1 out of 10 who come into an emergency room will be dead within a year.

We know that there has been great success in finding alternatives to opioid medication. In fact, Colorado emergency rooms and the Colorado Hospital Association, working together with a number of hospitals, developed a program called Alternatives to Opioids, or ALTO, which is a program that we actually introduced legislation on—Senator BOOKER, myself, Senator BENNET, and others—to try to make sure that emergency rooms don't just turn to opioid medication but find other alternatives because there are other alternatives. You don't just have to prescribe an opioid-based medication.

As a result, opioid prescriptions out of the emergency room have decreased by 36 percent over the 6-month course of this pilot program in Colorado. Those are remarkable results. We introduced legislation to mimic the same thing and to learn best practices at the Federal level so that hospitals around the country can work together, share those best practices, identify what works, and use them.

We have to reform the Medicaid Program so there is no incentive for doctors to overprescribe addictive medication. In Alamosa, physicians we talked to are entering into contracts with their patients. At San Luis Valley Health Regional Medical Center, they are entering into contracts with patients about the responsibility that goes with taking these powerful, powerful drugs.

We found new ways to make sure that the pill mills are being discovered and abandoned. We try to make sure that people can communicate with each other on how these treatments work.

While I was in Colorado, we talked about the devastation that drugs are having on their small communities. We learned about a group of high schoolers who are talking to other high schools about the dangers of addiction and prescription and drug overdose. They are trying to work with each other to stop the cycle and to make sure that people who need help find help and hopefully will avoid it in the first place.

Perhaps, one of the most frightening things that I heard during this roundtable—being a parent with three children of my own, I often worry about what happens to them when they go to school and what pressures they face. Two of them are young now. Our daughter is 14, and she will be entering high school. I worry about the pressures they will face from their peers. I worry about them, and I worry about what happens to our community and to their friends with what is around them. But I never thought that I would hear what I heard in the San Luis Valley.

We were talking about prescriptions and reimbursement from Medicaid. One of the providers brought up a challenge

that they had with getting reimbursement. I later learned from a pharmacist that it may simply be a coding problem, and if it were coded correctly, the reimbursement would occur.

This is what this provider said. They were trying to make sure Medicaid could reimburse for the nasal spray of Narcan so that children could administer it to their parents when they overdosed, because it is easier for a young child or a little child to administer a nasal spray than to give an injection.

Kids are given nasal spray so they can revive their parents. If that parent goes to the emergency room at Swedish hospital in Denver, CO, revived by that child, 1 in 10 of those parents revived will not come back again because they will be dead.

We have done a lot of work in this country, and we have a lot more work to do when it comes to opiate addiction and crisis. We have a lot of work to do in this Congress to come together and find ways to stop this—to break the cycle, to make sure it is easier to prescribe the drugs that will help instead of create addictions.

We have talked to people who said they have to have 8 hours of training and certification, which makes it impossible for certain drugs to be administered by a physician in the emergency room because they don't have time to comply with the paperwork. They actually would rather prescribe this drug than the opiate-based drug because the opiate-based drug, they know, would create the possibility of addiction. Yet this other drug wouldn't. There are more barriers to prescribe the drug that wouldn't cause the harm than the drug that would cause the harm. So we have a lot of work to do. These aren't Republican issues or Democratic issues. They are our families' issues. They are our friends' issues. They are our communities' issues.

I will end it with this story. One of the healthcare professionals we talked to told a story of their son who was a golfer—an athlete, loved to golf. He was injured golfing, so they wanted to make sure their son was cared for so he could recover and go on to a golf career or whatever career he had in front of him. They took their son to the doctor. Their son was given Vicodin to address the pain from the injury. At this point in the story, the mother started to cry because she feels guilty and responsible for the very first treatment that led down a path of addiction and the eventual death of their son. All this mom wanted to do was help, and she now feels the blame of the powerful drug that led to the addiction and death of their son. It is not a unique story. That story has been shared far too many times around the country, and yet here we are once again talking about it.

So I encourage my colleagues, let's continue the great work we have already done. Let's do more. Let's work together, and let's make sure we can find solutions this country will be proud of. We will know this when our

communities recover and people stop dying.

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. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on the Pizzella nomination expire at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow and the Senate vote on confirmation of the Pizzella nomination; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; finally, that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISCAL YEAR 2018 INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am putting a hold on the Fiscal Year 2018 Intelligence Authorization Act, as currently drafted, for two reasons.

The bill marked up by the Senate Intelligence Committee included three amendments I offered, one of which required that the Director of National Intelligence, working with the Department of the Treasury, produce a report on the threat to the United States from Russian money laundering. My first objection to the current version of the bill is based on a change to that provision which downgrades responsibility for the report and removes the Department of the Treasury. The critical importance of this issue to our national security requires the highest level responsibility within the intelligence community. It also requires the direct involvement of the Department of the Treasury to ensure that all the Department's financial intelligence resources, including those that fall outside the intelligence community, are brought to bear.

My second objection, as I explained in my minority views to the bill in committee, is that it includes a provision stating that it is the sense of Congress "that WikiLeaks and the senior

leadership of WikiLeaks resemble a non-state hostile intelligence service often abetted by state actors and should be treated as such a service by the United States.” My concern with this language does not relate to the actions of WikiLeaks, which, as I have stressed in the past, was part of a direct attack on our democracy.

My concern is that the use of the novel phrase “non-state hostile intelligence service” may have legal, constitutional, and policy implications, particularly should it be applied to journalists inquiring about secrets. The language in the bill suggesting that the U.S. Government has some unstated course of action against “non-state hostile intelligence services” is equally troubling.

The damage done by WikiLeaks to the United States is clear, but with any new challenge to our country, Congress ought not react in a manner that could have negative consequences, unforeseen or not, for our constitutional principles. The introduction of vague, undefined new categories of enemies constitutes such an ill-considered reaction.

50th ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAIR HOUSING ACT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Fair Housing Act. On this day in 1968, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law groundbreaking legislation to protect Americans from housing discrimination and uphold the values of fairness and equality under the law.

Prior to the passage of the law and its subsequent amendments, it was legal for Americans to be denied access to housing based on their race, color, national origin, religion, gender, disability, or familial status. African-American soldiers returning from fighting for their country on foreign shores would come home to find that they couldn't purchase a house in certain neighborhoods because of the color of their skin. The Fair Housing Act was a bold commitment to eradicating this kind of discrimination, which still continues to this day.

When my own parents moved to New Jersey, illegal racial real estate steering efforts nearly kept them from buying a house in an all-White neighborhood. It took a sting operation coordinated by the local Fair Housing Council with a White couple posing as my parents to break the cycle of segregation in the town in which I would eventually grow up. The Fair Housing Act empowered my parents and their advocates and lawyers to press for their right to fair and quality housing, and it stands today as one of the seminal pieces of legislation passed in our country's history.

Today, as we recognize the 50th anniversary of the Fair Housing Act, we remember that this landmark civil rights law was not meant to be the end of our

efforts to make housing in this country more fair and more just, but just the beginning.

We know we have so much work left to do when it comes to expanding access to affordable, safe, and fair housing in America, and we must remain committed to protecting and expanding on the progress made 50 years ago today by the Fair Housing Act.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO RENEE SPROW

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the contributions of Renee Sprow, who dedicated over 30 years of service to the Small Business Development Center, SBDC, network. Ms. Sprow spent her career promoting economic development and the growth of small businesses, which means that she spent her career helping countless people and their families achieve the American dream.

One of many highlights of Ms. Sprow's service to the Federal Government and private industry was her critical role in helping to establish the National Minority Purchasing Council, now known as the National Minority Supplier Development Council, which reports private contracts exceeding \$1 billion to minority suppliers. She designed and directed small, minority and women-owned subcontracting programs for major Federal and private-sector construction and revitalization projects, resulting in the award of multimillion dollar subcontracts.

Under Ms. Sprow's leadership as director of the Maryland SBDC, the value of contracts awarded to minority firms who met the U.S. Department of Defense's Socially and Economically Disadvantaged Business Utilization qualifications increased by more than 200 percent.

Ms. Sprow also participated in the drafting of Public Law 95-507, which established the legal authority to reshape Federal procurement policy for contracting with minority and women-owned firms. As an entrepreneur herself, Mr. Sprow owned and operated two businesses that generated annual revenues exceeding \$1 million.

Ms. Sprow's objective while serving as director of the Maryland SBDC was to contribute to economic development within the State by making the network responsive to the needs of Maryland's small business community. She deftly managed a \$4.3 million annual budget and 50 staff members in 22 offices located throughout Maryland. During her tenure, she realigned the SBDC network to target assistance to businesses more effectively and efficiently. In 2009, one of her regions ranked first in region III and second nationwide for the annual SBDC of the Year award presented by the Small Business Administration, SBA. In addition, the Washington, DC, and Baltimore district SBA offices each selected a Maryland SBDC region as the winner of the 2009 SBDC Excellence and Innovation Center Award.

Ms. Sprow transformed the SBDC network's operational methods to favor economic outcomes over mere output. To do so, she instituted a management performance system to ensure accountability for network performance. This management tool for evaluating, measuring, analyzing, and improving SBDC operations also helped objectively determine economic impact and customer satisfaction.

Ms. Sprow established a subsidiary program to assist firms in obtaining government contracts. In 2008, the program's clients obtained more than \$37 million in government contracts. In conjunction, she developed industry assistance programs for high technology, retail, construction, and green business opportunities in response to client needs. Under Ms. Sprow's leadership, the Maryland SBDC attained national accreditation in 2000, 2005, and 2009. It is no surprise that, thanks in part to Ms. Sprow's significant contributions, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has named Maryland the No. 1 State in the Nation for entrepreneurship and innovation.

Ms. Sprow received a B.A. in business administration from Howard University and a master's degree in business administration, specializing in marketing, from The George Washington University. She was the guest of honor at a luncheon last week, while the Senate was in recess, to celebrate her career and her retirement, so I wanted to take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Ms. Sprow for her exemplary service to her community, to Maryland, and the Nation and to send our best wishes for a happy and fulfilling retirement.

TRIBUTE TO DR. KENNETH A. BERTRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the service and achievements of an esteemed and valued member of the U.S. Senior Executive Service, Dr. Kenneth A. Bertram, who completes a 32-year career of distinguished service to our Nation on June 30, 2018.

Dr. Bertram has worked tirelessly to improve the medical readiness of U.S. military personnel, and challenged the constraints of a burdensome acquisition system that discouraged meaningful partnerships between military medicine and the commercial sector. His work culminated in the creation of the Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium, a South Carolina-based nonprofit corporation that connects more than 170 private-sector companies, academic research institutions, and nonprofit organizations to the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, fostering research collaborations to prevent injuries and disease impacting our Nation's soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, treating those who are wounded in conflict and restoring the injured to the maximum achievable quality of life.

Dr. Bertram's personal awards include the Meritorious Civilian Service Medal, the Superior Civilian Service Medal, two awards of the Legion of Merit, "A" Proficiency Designator in Hematology/Oncology from the Surgeon General of the U.S. Army, Order of Military Medical Merit, two awards of the U.S. Army Meritorious Service Medal, and two awards of the U.S. Army Commendation Medal. Dr. Bertram's professionalism, patriotism, and sustained selfless commitment to service reflect the very best values of our Nation's Senior Executive Service. I join his family and friends in wishing him the best in the years ahead.

REMEMBERING BRONSON C. LA FOLLETTE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Bronson C. La Follette, who was born in 1936 in Washington, DC, and passed away March 15, 2018, in Madison, WI. Bronson dedicated his life to the pursuit of justice and was known as the People's Lawyer. He was a progressive in the tradition of his father, Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., and his grandparents Senator Robert M. "Fighting Bob" La Follette, Sr., and Belle Case La Follette.

A true Badger at heart, Bronson earned his bachelor's and law degrees from the University of Wisconsin—Madison. Following his graduation in 1960, he worked in private practice before being appointed Assistant U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin by U.S. Attorney General Robert Kennedy. In 1964, at the age of 28, he was elected as Wisconsin's attorney general and served two terms. He was the youngest state attorney general in American history ever elected to the office. As attorney general, he was a champion for consumer protection and served as chair of President Lyndon Johnson's Consumer Advisory Council.

In 1968, Bronson became the Democratic Party's nominee for Governor of Wisconsin, an election he lost to incumbent Governor Warren Knowles. In 1974, Bronson was again elected as attorney general of Wisconsin, vowing to make the department of justice live up to its name. To Bronson, that meant taking on an activist role, hiring a bright young progressive team, and not being afraid to tackle new ideas and sensitive subjects head on. Wisconsinites will recognize some of the attorneys who made up that bright, young team because two of them have become iconic progressives in their own right. Ed Garvey and Kathleen Falk spent a portion of their early careers in Bronson La Follette's department of justice.

In 1978, Bronson married the love of his life, Barbara. He was also blessed with a son, a daughter, two grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren.

In 1987, Bronson retired from public service and joined a prominent law firm where he continued to advocate for criminal justice reform and government transparency.

Bronson was also a passionate advocate for children. He founded the Dane County Project for the Prevention of Child Abuse and became the chairman of the National Campaign for Missing and Exploited Children.

No tribute to Bronson La Follette would be complete without a nod to his wonderful sense of humor. Together with his friend, State treasurer Charles Smith, he campaigned in a camper, bringing their unique blend of politics and fun to communities throughout the State. He cherished his reputation as a talented washboard player and percussionist. His most remembered antics involved his Irish Setter "Cutter." When Bronson was cited with allowing Cutter to run at large in Maple Bluff, he hired Madison attorney and prankster Edward Ben Elson to defend the dog. Elson demanded that the dog be tried by a jury of his peers: 12 Irish Setters. In his next campaign, Bronson had buttons featuring Cutter with the slogan "Bronson dog gone it."

A colorful spectrum of words is necessary to capture the essence of Bronson La Follette, some of which may seem contradictory. Those words include progressive, irreverent, bipartisan, entertaining, passionate, fair, outspoken, just, funny, service-minded, champion, fun-loving, defender, activist, committed, blunt, values-driven, but what I will remember most about Bronson is how vigorously he embraced his personality, how sweetly he loved his family, and how passionately he fought for justice. Wisconsin owes a debt of gratitude to this extraordinary man who brought equality and justice to so many.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE SIKH COMMUNITY IN NEW JERSEY

• Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the important contributions of the Sikh community in New Jersey and across the country. New Jersey is enriched by the diversity of its residents who have promoted a climate of social tolerance and intellectual pluralism that has sustained our State throughout its history. Since first immigrating to the United States from Punjab, India, over 100 years ago, the Sikh community has played a critical role in enhancing and contributing to New Jersey and our Nation.

This month, Sikhs in New Jersey and across the country will celebrate their most significant annual event, Vaisakhi, the Sikh New Year; providing the Sikh community the time to remember history, celebrate collectively, and recommit to their religious traditions.

The New Jersey Sikh community has demonstrated a strong commitment to public service. Every Gurdwara, the Sikh place of worship, has a Langar, a free community kitchen that serves all visitors regardless of religion, caste,

gender, economic status, or ethnicity. The Langar instills the notion of equality and the brotherhood for all. Every November, the New Jersey Sikh community expands on this tradition and organizes the "Let's Share a Meal" event that distributes meals to homeless shelters in the area. In 2017, 275 Sikh community members prepared, packed, and delivered meals to 84 shelters over 2 days. This served more than 15,000 New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania residents.

New Jersey also recently welcomed three Sikh Americans as new public officials. On January 1, 2018, Ravi Bhalla became Hoboken's 30th mayor and the State's first Sikh mayor. Bhalla had previously served two terms on Hoboken's city council. Although Bhalla experienced periodic hateful attacks during his mayoral campaign, voters resoundingly rejected such divisive rhetoric when they elected him mayor.

In addition to electing its first Sikh mayor, New Jersey also elected Balvir Singh as a member of the Burlington County Board of Chosen Freeholders, making him the first Sikh American to win a countywide election in New Jersey. Singh, who served for nearly 2 years as a member of the Burlington Township Board of Education, was sworn into office on January 3, 2018.

New Jersey is also home to the Nation's first Sikh State attorney general, Gurbir Grewal. Grewal had previously served as the Bergen County prosecutor. The State Senate unanimously approved his appointment by a 29-0 vote on January 16. Grewal will enforce the law in a manner that protects all New Jersey residents.

The broad support that these three individuals garnered is a testament to New Jersey's culture of inclusion of individuals of all ethnicities and religious backgrounds.

However, we know that Sikh Americans across the country continue to endure discrimination and hateful attacks, from school bullying to verbal assaults to violence.

I invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing the important contributions of the Sikh community across the country as it celebrates its New Year festival. May we join with Sikh Americans in rejecting discrimination of any kind and embracing the rich diversity that makes each of our States strong and whole.●

REMEMBERING HARRY SHIPLEY, JR.

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the life of Harry Shipley, Jr., from my hometown of Fort Smith, AR. Mr. Shipley was a husband, father, veteran, businessman, and community leader. He passed away on March 24, 2018, at the age of 96.

Born in 1922 during the Great Depression, Shipley graduated from Fort

Smith High School, where he was student body president. He attended the University of Arkansas and served as student commander of the Army ROTC while earning a degree in business.

A member of the Greatest Generation, he was a second lieutenant in reconnaissance and intelligence in the U.S. Army during World War II. He served in the European Theater and was injured in the Battle of Siegfried Line. Shipley received the Bronze Star and Purple Heart for his service to his country.

After the war, he graduated from the American Institute of Baking in Chicago, IL, and joined his father at the Shipley Baking Company. He worked there for 54 years, from 1945 to 1996, along with his brother and sons. He retired in 1996 as chairman of the board after the company was sold to Flower Foods.

Mr. Shipley was also a man of faith and someone who was involved in his community in a variety of ways. He was a lifetime member of First United Methodist Church and served as an usher and on several committees within the congregation.

I join with many in the Fort Smith community to honor Harry Shipley, Jr., and the wonderful legacy he leaves behind. My thoughts and prayers are with his loved ones as they mourn his passing and celebrate his life.●

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF COASTAL ENTERPRISES, INC.

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize the 40th anniversary of Coastal Enterprises, Inc., CEI. Headquartered in Brunswick, ME, CEI is a national leader in rural economic development, helping to grow businesses and support communities through providing financing assistance and support for environmentally sustainable practices to increase prosperity in Maine and across the country. CEI provides loans and technical assistance to small businesses and community development stakeholders while simultaneously advancing changes in public policy to promote an environment ripe for economic growth.

Since its founding, CEI has been a mission-driven organization, striving to enable all people, especially those from low-income backgrounds, to reach their full potential. With a joint focus on economic growth and environmental health, CEI has tirelessly worked for 40 years to create a Maine economy that is sustainable both for our citizens and our land.

CEI's immense impact is undisputed; since inception, they have financed \$1.32 billion dollars' worth of loans, helping over 2,700 businesses. These companies often provide the backbone of their communities, in total employing over 37,000 people. Furthermore, CEI has been instrumental in the areas of affordable housing and childcare. Through their investments, they have created or preserved 2,075 affordable

housing units and 5,818 childcare slots, providing much-needed relief for families.

The success of the last 40 years speaks to the vision of the founders and the dedication of CEI's employees. We are lucky to have Coastal Enterprises, Inc., in our State, and I wish to congratulate them on their 40th anniversary. I am looking forward to watching the positive impacts of CEI's work for years to come.●

REMEMBERING WILLIAM "BILL" VARN

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today I would like to take a moment to recognize and honor the life of William "Bill" Varn, a great South Carolinian, who departed this life on November 18, 2017. Bill was a veteran of the U.S. Navy and served in World War II. After the war, Bill joined and eventually took over Enterprise Bank, originally located in Smoaks, SC. Mr. Varn served as CEO from 1951 to 2013, when he was named director emeritus last spring. It is believed that he is South Carolina's longest serving banker ever, and dedicated more than 70 years of his life to the industry. Today Emeritus Bank is a \$333 million institution spread across six SC counties.

Mr. Varn will be remembered not only for the great contributions he made in the financial services industry, but also for his love of his country, State, and family.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FAIRVIEW BAPTIST CHURCH

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate and honor Fairview Baptist Church in Spartanburg, SC for their 100th anniversary, which will be celebrated on June 24, 2018. Fairview Baptist Church was established in 1918 by a group of residents of the Fairview community, known also as the Flatwoods, under direction of Rev. C.M. Ellis and nine charter members. Starting with only 40 members 100 years ago, Fairview Baptist has since grown to include hundreds from the Spartanburg area, while still remaining a welcoming and devoted place of worship in the community.

I acknowledge and celebrate the church's 100 years as a congregation faithfully serving the people of Spartanburg.●

200TH ANNIVERSARY OF STANDING SPRINGS BAPTIST CHURCH

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate and honor Standing Springs Baptist Church in Simpsonville, SC, for their 200th anniversary, which will be celebrated on October 18, 2018. As Standing Springs celebrates their bicentennial throughout the week and weekend, I thank them for their ongoing mission of service and fellowship that I hope will con-

tinue for 200 more years to come. I acknowledge and celebrate the church's 200 years as a congregation faithfully serving the people of Simpsonville and Greenville County.●

UNVEILING OF THE BISHOPVILLE JAMES DAVISON HERIOT STATUE ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMISTICE DAY

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the American Legion Post 29 in Bishopville, SC as they celebrate the unveiling of the James Davison Heriot statue in downtown Bishopville on Sunday, November 11, 2018. James Davison Heriot was a South Carolina National Guard soldier who received the Medal of Honor for his actions during World War I.

Post 29 is honoring the Americans who fought in World War I by unveiling this statue on the 100th anniversary of the end of the American involvement in the conflict, previously known as Armistice Day. I look forward to the unveiling of the Bishopville Heriot statue, as well as all other commemorations that will take place on this special 100th anniversary.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2219. An act to increase the role of the financial industry in combating human trafficking.

H.R. 4203. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with regard to stalking.

H.R. 4921. An act to require the Surface Transportation Board to implement certain recommendations of the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation.

H.R. 4925. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration to implement certain recommendations for management and collection of railroad safety data.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 431(a)(3) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-31), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following individuals on the part of the House to the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission: Ms. Rebecca Kleefisch of Oconomowoc, Wisconsin and Ms. Heather Higgins of New York, New York.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:19 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 bills:

H.R. 3445. An act to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3979. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer services, community partnership, and

refuge education programs of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were 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. 2219. An act to increase the role of the financial industry in combating human trafficking; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4203. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with regard to stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4921. An act to require the Surface Transportation Board to implement certain recommendations of the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4925. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration to implement certain recommendations for management and collection of railroad safety data; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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-4774. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Final Sequestration Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2018"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4775. A communication from the Acting Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Truth in Lending—Real Estate Settlement Procedures" ((7 CFR Part 1940) (RIN0575-AD11)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4776. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment for 2018" (RIN0510-AA04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4777. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Lemons From Chile Into the Conti-

nental United States" (RIN0579-AE20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4778. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Support of Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies" (RIN0790-AK04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4779. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Support of Civil Authorities" (RIN0790-AK06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4780. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4781. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Herbert R. McMaster, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4782. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Terry J. Benedict, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4783. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of fifteen (15) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4784. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting proposed legislation relative to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4785. A communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the review of the post courts-martial actions in the case of the 1944 Port Chicago Explosion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4786. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to United States Citizens Detained by Iran; to the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Finance; and Foreign Relations.

EC-4787. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4788. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Collection and Transmission of Annual AMC Registry Fees" ((12 CFR Part 1102) (Docket No. AS17-07)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4789. A communication from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Consumer Response Annual Report"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4790. A communication from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's Office of Minority and Women Inclusion Annual Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4791. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of the February 2017 Australia Group (AG) Intersectoral Decisions and the June 2017 AG Plenary Understandings; Addition of India to the AG" (RIN0694-AH37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4792. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Assessment Regulations" ((12 CFR Part 327) (RIN3064-AE40)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4793. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Minimum Security Procedures Amendments to FDIC Regulations" (RIN3064-AE47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4794. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Consumer Protection in Sales of Insurance" (RIN3064-AE49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4795. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Real Estate Appraisals" (RIN1700-AE81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4796. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to discretionary appropriations legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-4797. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inflation Adjustments to Civil Monetary Penalty Rates for Calendar Year 2018" (RIN1012-AA23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4798. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled “Repeal of Regulatory Amendment and Restoration of Former Regulatory Language Governing Service of Official Correspondence” (RIN1012-AA22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4799. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to New Mexico” (FRL No. 9975-94-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4800. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Alaska: Regional Haze Progress Report” (FRL No. 9976-71-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4801. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Missouri; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference” (FRL No. 9976-48-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4802. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Findings of Failure to Submit State Implementation Plan Submissions for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)” (FRL No. 9976-35-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4803. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of Nebraska Air Quality Implementation Plans, Operating Permits Program, and 112(l) Program; Revision to Nebraska Administrative Code” (FRL No. 9976-52-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4804. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District” (FRL No. 9976-06-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4805. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Wyoming; Sheridan PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request” (FRL No. 9975-84-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in

the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4806. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Revisions to the Transportation Conformity Consultation Process” (FRL No. 9976-02-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4807. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Quality Designations for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard—Round 3—Supplemental Amendment” (FRL No. 9976-40-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4808. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; South Carolina; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference” (FRL No. 9974-17-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4809. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to tariffs on aluminum and steel imports; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4810. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4811. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Initial Guidance Under Section 163(j) as Applicable to Taxable Years Beginning After December 31, 2017” (Notice 2018-28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4812. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Announcement and Report Concerning Advance Pricing Agreements” (Notice 2018-08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 3, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4813. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Additional Guidance Under Section 965; Guidance Under Sections 62, 962, and 6081 in Connection With Section 965; and Penalty Relief Under Sections 6654 and 6655 in Connection With Section 965 and Repeal of Section 958(b) (4)” (Notice 2018-26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of

the Senate on April 3, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4814. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Security Considerations with Respect to Country-by-Country Reporting” (Notice 2018-31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 3, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4815. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Guidance Regarding the Implementation of New Section 1446(f) for Partnership Interests That Are Not Publicly Traded” (Notice 2018-29) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 3, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4816. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Guidance Under Section 1061, Partnership Interests Held in Connection with Performance of Services” (Notice 2018-18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 3, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4817. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Age 100 Guidance for 2017 CSO Tables” (Rev. Proc. 2018-20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 3, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4818. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Definition of Importer Security Filing Importer” (RIN1651-AA98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4819. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Port Limits of Savannah, GA” (CBP Dec. 18-03) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4820. A joint communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4821. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2018-0030 - 2018-0035); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4822. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services for the operation, training, and maintenance of ScanEagle and Integrator Unmanned Aerial System for end use by the Royal Saudi Land Forces in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more

(Transmittal No. DDTC 17-134); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4823. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of fully automatic machine guns, gun barrels, spare parts, and accessories to Bahrain in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-097); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4824. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of machine guns, spare parts, and accessories to Saudi Arabia in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-118); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4825. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to Norway to support the integration, installation, operation, training, testing, O-Level maintenance, and repair of F-135 propulsion systems in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-068); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4826. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to Germany and Israel to support the design, development, and manufacture of magazines, grips, new variations of pistols, and other firearm components by Israel (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-102); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4827. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to Israel to support the Missile Firing Unit and Stunner Interceptor Subsystems of the David's Sling Weapon System in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-107); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4828. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to support qualification, modification, test, repair, and integration of components for Tamir Interceptor missiles for end-use by the Ministry of Defense for Israel in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-120); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4829. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to Canada and the United Kingdom for the production of Tomahawk Missile Electronic Assemblies in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-121); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4830. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to

section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of semi-automatic pistols of various calibers to Canada for commercial resale in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-145); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4831. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of bolt action rifles and semi-automatic rifles of various calibers to Canada for commercial resale in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-131); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4832. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy Act; Implementation" (RIN0925-AA63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 3, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4833. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Applications for Regenerative Medicine Advanced Therapies"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4834. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a performance report relative to the Animal Drug User Fee Act for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4835. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a performance report relative to the Animal Drug User Fee Act for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4836. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report relative to the Animal Drug User Fee Act for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4837. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report relative to the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4838. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cigarettes, Smokeless Tobacco, and Covered Tobacco Products; Change of Office Name and Address; Technical Amendment" ((21 CFR Part 1140) (Docket No. FDA-2018-N-0011)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4839. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices; Technical Amendment" ((21 CFR Parts 890, 800, 1020, and 1040) (Docket No. FDA-2018-N-0011)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4840. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Good Guidance Practices; Technical Amendment" ((21 CFR Part 10) (Docket No. FDA-2018-N-1097)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4841. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Organization; Technical Amendment" ((21 CFR Part 5) (Docket No. FDA-2018-N-0011)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4842. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission'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-4843. A communication from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission'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-4844. A communication from the Administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration'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-4845. A communication from the Director, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department'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-4846. A communication from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2017 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-4847. A communication from the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation'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-4848. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission'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-4849. A communication from the Chief Judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the District of Columbia

Family Court Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4850. A communication from the General Counsel, Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight 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-4851. A communication from the Director, Congressional Affairs and Public Relations, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency'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-4852. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission'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-4853. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Stronger Management of the Housing Production Trust Fund Could Build More Affordable Housing"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4854. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Seven Fentanyl-Related Substances In Schedule I" (Docket No. DEA-475) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4855. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of MAB-CHMINACA In Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act" (Docket No. DEA-421) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4856. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Fentanyl-Related Substances In Schedule I" (Docket No. DEA-476) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4857. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Cyclopropyl Fentanyl In Schedule I" (Docket No. DEA-474) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4858. 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 Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Wappoo Creek, Charleston, SC" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0713)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4859. 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 Zones Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0090)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4860. 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 Zones Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0246)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4861. 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; Lower Mississippi River, Port Gibson, MS" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0229)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4862. 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: Pier 39 Fireworks Display, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0125)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4863. 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; Cape Fear River, NC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0965)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4864. 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: Juan Benitez Fireworks Display, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0063)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4865. 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: Vigor Industrial Drydock Movement, West Duwamish Waterway; Seattle, WA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-1061)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4866. 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: Recurring Fireworks Display Within the Fifth Coast Guard District" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0182)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Com-

mittee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4867. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications; Establishing Just and Reasonable Rates for Local Exchange Carriers; Developing a Unified Inter-carrier Compensation Regime" ((RIN3060-AK57) (FCC 18-29)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4868. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for the Mobility Fund Phase II Challenge Process" ((WC Docket No. 10-90 and WT Docket No. 10-208) (DA 18-186)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4869. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 22, 24, 27, 90, and 95 of the Commission's Rules to Improve Wireless Coverage Through the Use of Signal Boosters" ((WT Docket No. 10-4) (FCC 18-35)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4870. A communication from the Associate Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment" ((WT Docket No. 17-79) (FCC 18-30)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4871. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 56th Annual Report of the activities of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1160. A bill to include Livingston County, the city of Jonesboro in Union County, and the city of Freeport in Stephenson County, Illinois, to the Lincoln National Heritage Area, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-224).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1181. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-225).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1260. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain Federal land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore for certain non-Federal

land in Jackson County, Mississippi, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-226).

S. 1602. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Finger Lakes National Heritage Area, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-227).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2615. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore, Jackson County, Mississippi, between the National Park Service and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-228).

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. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2644. A bill to ensure independent investigations and judicial review of the removal of a special counsel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2645. A bill to establish a demonstration program under which the Drug Enforcement Administration provides grants to certain States to enable those States to increase participation in drug take-back programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2646. A bill to establish a pilot program administered by the Secretary of Labor, in collaboration with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to award competitive grants to counties (or other equivalent entities) and Tribal entities to administer combined workforce training and drug addiction treatment and recovery programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2647. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to strengthen requirements related to nutrient information on food labels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2648. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage employers to hire individuals working in dying industries or occupations made obsolete by technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 2649. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a natural gas demand response pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2650. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to add definitions for the terms "common carrier" and "personal operator", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 2651. A bill to promote competition and help consumers save money by giving them the freedom to choose where they buy prescription pet medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2652. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Stephen Michael Gleason; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. COONS):

S.J. Res. 58. A joint resolution to require certifications regarding actions by Saudi Arabia in Yemen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 457. A resolution to authorize testimony and representation in Kuwait & Gulf Link Transport Co., et al. v. John Doe, et al. (Ct. of Common Pleas, Cumberland County, Pa.); considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 458. A resolution designating April 11, 2018, as the "Sesquicentennial of Connecticut's Navy Installation"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 459. A resolution recognizing "Black Maternal Health Week" to bring national attention to the maternal health care crisis in the Black community and the importance of reducing the rate of maternal mortality and morbidity among Black women; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 379

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 379, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 533

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 533, a bill to modernize the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988.

S. 1086

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1086, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

S. 1533

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 1533, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1890

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1890, a bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, and for other purposes.

S. 1990

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1990, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amounts payable by the Department of Veterans Affairs for dependency and indemnity compensation, to modify the requirements for dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain veterans rated totally disabled at the time of death, and for other purposes.

S. 2060

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2060, a bill to promote democracy and human rights in Burma, and for other purposes.

S. 2177

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2177, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a minimum salary threshold for bona fide executive, administrative, and professional employees exempt from Federal overtime compensation requirements, and automatically update such threshold every 3 years.

S. 2230

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2230, a bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to improve services for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

S. 2260

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2260, a bill to establish and fund an Opioids and STOP Initiative to expand, intensify, and coordinate fundamental, translational, and clinical research of the National Institutes of Health with respect to opioid abuse, the understanding of pain, and the discovery and development of safer and more effective treatments and preventive interventions for pain.

S. 2334

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana

(Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2334, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide clarity with respect to, and to modernize, the licensing system for musical works under section 115 of that title, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of that title, and for other purposes.

S. 2387

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) 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. 2586

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2586, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the ability of a State to administer a permit program under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2587

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2587, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a program to allow States to assume certain Federal responsibilities under that Act with respect to agency actions applicable to highway projects within the States, and for other purposes.

S. 2588

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2588, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish a program to allow States to assume certain Federal responsibilities under that title with respect to agency actions applicable to highway projects within the States, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 57

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 57, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act".

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

S. RES. 286

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 286, a resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in the poorest countries have access to a quality education through the Global Partnership for Education.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 457—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY AND REPRESENTATION IN KUWAIT & GULF LINK TRANSPORT CO., ET AL. V. JOHN DOE, ET AL. (CT. OF COMMON PLEAS, CUMBERLAND COUNTY, PA.)

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 457

Whereas, in the case of *Kuwait & Gulf Link Transport Co., et al. v. John Doe, et al.*, Case No. 2012-1820-CIVIL TERM, pending in the Court of Common Pleas for Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, deposition testimony has been subpoenaed from Richard Goldberg, a former employee in the office of Senator Mark Kirk, relating to his official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current and former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Richard Goldberg is authorized to testify in the case of *Kuwait & Gulf Link Transport Co., et al. v. John Doe, et al.*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Richard Goldberg in connection with the testimony authorized in section one of this resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Democratic leader, Mr. SCHUMER, I send to the desk a resolution authorizing testimony and representation by the Senate Legal Counsel, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. President, this resolution concerns a civil case pending in the Court

of Common Pleas for Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, in which defense contracting logistics firms based in Kuwait have sued competitor firms for defamation and tortious interference for allegedly sending false emails to various U.S. government agencies harming the plaintiff companies. The complaint asserts that in 2011 representatives of the defendants communicated allegedly harmful allegations to a number of government agencies and officials, including an employee in the office of then-Senator Mark Kirk. Senator Kirk forwarded the information for investigation by the Defense and Treasury Departments.

The plaintiffs issued a subpoena seeking deposition testimony from the former Senate staffer about his communications with the defendants' representatives about these allegations. Senator Kirk would like to cooperate by providing relevant and unprivileged staff testimony about these communications.

Accordingly, consistent with the rules of the Senate and Senate practice, this resolution would authorize former Senator Kirk's staffer to testify at a deposition. The resolution would also authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to represent Senator Kirk's former employee in connection with his testimony.

SENATE RESOLUTION 458—DESIGNATING APRIL 11, 2018, AS THE "SESQUICENTENNIAL OF CONNECTICUT'S NAVY INSTALLATION"

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 458

Whereas the Navy Installation of Connecticut, regarded as Naval Submarine Base New London, had its beginning as a naval yard and storage depot on April 11, 1868;

Whereas the people of Connecticut made the installation possible when a deed of gift from the State of Connecticut and city of New London was signed, conveyed, and presented to Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles;

Whereas the Navy Installation of Connecticut was first used for laying up inactive ships, then for refueling small naval ships traveling through the waters of New England, and ultimately as the first submarine base of the United States Navy;

Whereas October 18, 1915, marked the arrival at the Navy Installation of Connecticut of the submarines G-1, G-2, and G-4 under the care of the tender USS *Ozark* (Monitor No. 7), soon followed by the arrival of submarines E-1, D-1, and D-3 under the care of the tender USS *Tonopah* (Monitor No. 8), and on November 2, 1915, the arrival of the first ship built as a submarine tender, the USS *Fulton* (AS-1);

Whereas, on June 21, 1916, Commander Yates Stirling, Jr., assumed the command of the newly designated Naval Submarine Base New London, the New London Submarine Flotilla, and the Submarine School;

Whereas the property of Naval Submarine Base New London expanded during the course of the involvement of the United

States in World War I, with Congress approving more than \$1,000,000 for real estate and facilities expansion, which created 81 buildings to support 1,400 men and 20 submarines by the end of World War I;

Whereas the second largest expansion of Naval Submarine Base New London occurred during World War II when the submarine force exponentially grew in size, and the installation enlarged from 112 acres to 497 acres to accommodate the thousands of personnel that serviced the growing fleet;

Whereas the nuclear power age following World War II ushered technological advancements in submarine development with the advent of nuclear powered submarines and the arrival of the USS *Nautilus* (SSN-571), the first nuclear powered vessel in the world, when it was commissioned in 1954 at Naval Submarine Base New London;

Whereas the USS *George Washington* (SSBN-598), the first nuclear ballistic submarine of the United States Navy, created further changes at Naval Submarine Base New London when it was commissioned there in 1959;

Whereas, in 2018, Naval Submarine Base New London extends along the east side of the Thames River, occupies approximately 687 acres, and houses more than 160 major facilities and more than 15 nuclear submarines;

Whereas Naval Submarine Base New London supports fleet readiness by providing quality service and facilities to its fleet, fighters, and families;

Whereas the mission of Naval Submarine Base New London is—

(1) to homeport and put submarines to sea; and

(2) to support the Submarine Center of Excellence, which trains submariners to take submarines to sea;

Whereas nearly every submariner in the United States Navy will be stationed at Naval Submarine Base New London for training, with a potential tour of duty in one of the attack submarines homeported at the installation, or with a pre-commissioning unit for a new submarine under construction at General Dynamics Electric Boat Shipyard in Groton, Connecticut;

Whereas Naval Submarine Base New London is home to more than 70 tenant commands and activities including—

(1) the Undersea Warfighting Development Center;

(2) the Submarine Learning Center;

(3) the Naval Submarine School;

(4) the Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory; and

(5) the Naval Undersea Medical Institute;

Whereas Naval Submarine Base New London is one of the largest employers in southeastern Connecticut and employs more than 9,500 active duty, reserve, and civilian personnel; and

Whereas Naval Submarine Base New London will always be regarded as the first submarine base of the United States Navy and the home of the submarine force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 11, 2018, as the “Sesquicentennial of Connecticut’s Navy Installation”;

(2) commends the longstanding dedication and contribution to the Navy by the people of Connecticut, both through the initial deed of gift that established the Navy Installation of Connecticut, and through their ongoing commitment to support the mission and people assigned to the installation, presently known as Naval Submarine Base New London;

(3) honors the sailors and submariners who have trained and served at the Navy Installation of Connecticut throughout its 150-year

history in support of the naval and undersea superiority of the United States;

(4) recognizes the indispensable role Naval Submarine Base New London plays in fortifying the national security of the United States at a time when adversaries seek to challenge the United States; and

(5) pledges continued support for the operation of Naval Submarine Base New London for years to come.

SENATE RESOLUTION 459—RECOGNIZING “BLACK MATERNAL HEALTH WEEK” TO BRING NATIONAL ATTENTION TO THE MATERNAL HEALTH CARE CRISIS IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY AND THE IMPORTANCE OF REDUCING THE RATE OF MATERNAL MORTALITY AND MORBIDITY AMONG BLACK WOMEN

Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 459

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Black mothers in the United States die at 3 to 4 times the rate of White mothers;

Whereas Black women in the United States suffer from life-threatening pregnancy complications twice as often as White women;

Whereas United States maternal mortality rates are the highest in the developed world and are increasing rapidly;

Whereas the United States has the highest maternal mortality rate among affluent countries because of the disproportionate death rate of Black mothers;

Whereas the premature delivery rate among Black women is 49 percent higher than the rate among all other women;

Whereas Black women are twice as likely to suffer from severe maternal morbidity than White women;

Whereas high rates of maternal mortality among Black women span across income and education levels, as well as socioeconomic status;

Whereas racial disparities exist across income and education levels;

Whereas structural racism, gender oppression, and social determinants of health inequities experienced by Black women in the United States significantly contribute to the disproportionately high rates of maternal mortality and morbidity among Black women;

Whereas race and racism play an integral role in maternal health outcomes, care, and policy;

Whereas fair distribution of resources, especially with regard to reproductive health care services and maternal health programming, is critical to closing the maternal health racial disparity gap; and

Whereas an investment must be made in Black women’s maternity care and in policies that support and promote affordable, comprehensive, and holistic maternal health care that is free from gender and racial discrimination: Now, therefore, be it

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes—

(1) that Black women are experiencing high, disproportionate rates of maternal mortality and morbidity in the United States;

(2) that the alarmingly high rates of maternal mortality among Black women is unacceptable;

(3) that Congress must work toward ensuring that the Black community has adequate housing, transportation equity, nutritious food, clean water, environments free from toxins, fair treatment within the criminal justice system, safety and freedom from violence, a living wage, and equal economic opportunity;

(4) that in order to improve maternal health outcomes, Congress must fully support and encourage policies grounded in the human rights framework that addresses Black maternal health inequity;

(5) that Black women must be active participants in the policy decisions that impact their lives;

(6) that “Black Maternal Health Week” is an opportunity to increase attention of the state of Black maternal health in the United States, amplify the voices of Black women and families, serve as a national platform for Black-women-led entities and efforts on maternal health, and enhance community organizing on Black maternal health; and

(7) the significance of April 11 through 17, 2018, as “Black Maternal Health Week”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I have 14 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 ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 10:15 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: 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.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Patrick Fuchs, of Wisconsin, and Michelle A. Schultz, of Pennsylvania, both to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, and Rebecca Kelly Slaughter, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner.

COMMITTEE HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “The Opioid Crisis Response Act of 2018.”

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “FEMA: Prioritizing a Culture of Preparedness.”

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “The President’s FY2019 budget Request for Indian Programs”.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on S. 1250 and S. 2515.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Mark Jeremy Bennett, of Hawaii, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Nancy E. Brasel, and Eric C. Tostrud, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, Robert R. Summerhays, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, and Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Paul R. Lawrence, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Benefits, and Joseph L. Falvey, Jr., of Michigan, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND
CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT
SUPPORT

The Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE,
CUSTOMS, AND GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

The Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Market Access Challenges in China.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

The Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Defeating Fentanyl: Addressing the Deadliest Drugs Fueling the Opioid Crisis.”

RECOGNIZING THE 5TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF
OSWALDO PAYA SARDINAS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 357, S. Res. 224.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 224) recognizing the 5th anniversary of the death of Oswaldo Paya Sardinas, and commemorating his legacy and commitment to democratic values and principles.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble and an amendment to the title.

(Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

(Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.)

Whereas Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas was born in Havana, Cuba, in 1952 and became a nonviolent critic of the communist government as a teenager, resulting in 3 years of imprisonment in 1969 at a work camp in Cuba, formerly known as “Isla de Pinos”;

Whereas, in 1988, Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas founded the Christian Liberation Movement that called for peaceful civil disobedience against the rule of the Communist Party of Cuba and advocated for civil liberties;

Whereas, in 1992 and 1997, attempts by Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas to run as a candidate for the National Assembly of People’s Power were rejected by Cuban authorities;

Whereas, in 1998, Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas and other leaders of the Christian Liberation Movement established the Varela Project in order to circulate a legal proposal to advocate for democratic political reforms within Cuba, including the establishment of freedom of association, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, free elections, freedom to start private businesses, and amnesty for political prisoners;

Whereas, in 2002, the Varela Project delivered a petition to the National Assembly of People’s Power with 11,020 signatures from Cuban citizens calling for a referendum on safeguarding basic freedoms, an end to one-party rule, and citing Article 88 of the Constitution of Cuba that allows Cuban citizens to propose laws if the proposal is made by at least 10,000 Cuban citizens who are eligible to vote;

Whereas, in 2003, Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas delivered the petition to the National Assembly of People’s Power with an additional 14,000 signatures, establishing the biggest nonviolent campaign to oppose the Communist Party of Cuba;

Whereas, in March 2003, the crackdown on Cuban dissidents by the Government of Cuba, referred to as the “Black Spring”, led to the imprisonment of 75 individuals, including 25 members of the Varela Project and 40 members of the Christian Liberation Movement, and the formation of the Ladies in White movement by the wives of the imprisoned activists;

Whereas, in 2007, Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas called on the National Assembly of People’s Power to grant amnesty to nonviolent political prisoners and to allow Cubans to travel freely without a government permit;

Whereas, in 2009, Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas developed a Call for the National Dialogue;

Whereas petitions and calls by Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas to the National Assembly of People’s Power were repeatedly dismissed and disparaged by the Government of Cuba;

Whereas Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas, his family, and friends endured years of harassment and intimidation for the peaceful political activism of Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas;

Whereas Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas has been formally recognized in the past for his dedication to the promotion of human rights and democracy, including by receiving the Homo Homini Award in 1999, the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought in 2002, the W. Averell Harriman Democracy Award from the United States National Democratic Institute for International Affairs in 2003, and being nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize by Václav Havel, the former President of the Czech Republic, in 2005;

Whereas, on July 22, 2012, Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas and Harold Cepero, a fellow pro-democracy activist, died in a troubling car crash in Granma Province, Cuba, after being followed by government agents;

Whereas the Government of Cuba has failed to conduct a credible investigation into the car crash that led to the death of Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas;

Whereas the trial and conviction of Angel Carromero, a youth leader of the People’s Party who was visiting Cuba and driving the car at the time of the crash, did not include testimony from key witnesses, and did not resolve questions about whether another car was involved or whether Mr. Carromero was coerced by the Government of Cuba into signing a false statement of guilt;

Whereas, in 2012, the United States Senate unanimously passed Senate Resolution 525, 112th Congress, agreed to July 31, 2012, honoring the life and legacy of Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas;

Whereas, in 2013, a number of United States Senators and the United States Department of State called for an impartial, third-party investigation by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States into the circumstances surrounding the death of Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas;

Whereas, in 2013, Angel Carromero spoke in detail during an interview with the Washington Post about being hit by another car during the crash, being mistreated and coerced by Cuban authorities following the crash, and being made the “scapegoat” by the Government of Cuba for the death of Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas;

Whereas the dissidents of the “Black Spring” have been released from prison, but the Government of Cuba continues to suppress, assault, and detain those peacefully expressing political beliefs contrary to or critical of the regime; and

Whereas the 2016 Human Rights Report on Cuba by the United States Department of State cited ongoing human rights abuses by the Government of Cuba, namely “the abridgement of the ability of citizens to choose their government; the use of government threats, physical

assault, intimidation, and violent government-organized counter protests against peaceful dissent; and harassment and detentions to prevent free expression and peaceful assembly.” Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,
That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and commemorates the legacy of Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas on the 6th anniversary of his death on July 22, 2018;

(2) honors the commitment of Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas to democratic values and principles;

(3) calls on the Government of Cuba to allow an impartial, third-party investigation into the circumstances surrounding the death of Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas;

(4) urges the United States to continue to support policies and programs that promote respect for human rights and democratic principles in Cuba in a manner that is consistent with the aspirations of the Cuban people;

(5) urges the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States to continue reporting on human rights issues in Cuba, and to request a visit to Cuba in order to investigate the circumstances surrounding the death of Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas; and

(6) calls on the Government of Cuba to cease violating human rights and to begin providing democratic political freedoms to Cuban citizens, including freedom of association, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, free elections, freedom to start private businesses, and amnesty for political prisoners.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the resolution be agreed to, the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, the committee-reported amendment to the title be agreed to, and the motions to consider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 224), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported title amendment was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A resolution recognizing the 6th anniversary of the death of Oswaldo Payá Sardiñas, and commemorating his legacy and commitment to democratic values and principles.”

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY AND REPRESENTATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 457, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 457) to authorize testimony and representation in Kuwait & Gulf Link Transport Co., et al. v. John Doe, et al.

(Ct. of Common Pleas, Cumberland County, Pa.)

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed, 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. 457) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF CONNECTICUT’S NAVY INSTALLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 458, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 458) designating April 11, 2018, as the “Sesquicentennial of Connecticut’s Navy Installation.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 458) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OHIO FIRST RESPONDER APPRECIATION WEEK

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to talk tonight about the brave Ohioans who dedicate themselves every day to protecting all of the rest of us; that is, our first responders. This week is Ohio First Responders Week, a week of appreciation, the theme being “Bringing Help, Bringing Hope.” Well said.

Police officers, firefighters, EMS professionals, and other first responders

put themselves in harm’s way for us every single day. They risk their own safety to care for others. They wake up every day, put on their uniforms, and carry out their duties with an unwavering commitment to their communities and a pledge to protect those around them.

This morning, we had our weekly Buckeye Coffee. We had people from all over Ohio there. Sure enough, a bunch of first responders showed up. It was the EMS chiefs association, and we had an opportunity to talk with them about what they are doing every day.

Of course, EMS help with regard to traffic accidents, gunshot wounds, and so on. But one of the new challenges they face that is taking an enormous amount of their time and effort is the opioid crisis. I would bet if you go to your firehouse and ask them, the first responders in our communities are responding more to overdose runs than they are to fires. This is one example of where they are on the frontlines dealing with this issue and are applying Narcan, the miracle drug that reverses the effects of an overdose to save lives.

We appreciate them, and the service and commitment of these first responders is needed now more than ever. I urge all Ohioans this week to demonstrate their thanks to first responders. If you live in a community that is having an event, which a number are, I hope you will attend the event. If not, if you cross paths with a first responder, thank him, thank her, and tell them we appreciate what they are doing.

I know I speak for the entire Buckeye State when I say that we are grateful for the work our first responders do every single day, and they will continue, as the theme says this year, to bring help and hope to all of us. We thank them.

STOP ENABLING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. On another topic, Mr. President, today is a big day in the fight against sex trafficking.

I just got back a couple of hours ago from a meeting at the White House where the President of the United States signed legislation that we have been working on for several years to be able to push back against the sex trafficking that is occurring online. It was very emotional. We had a lot of survivors, victims of sex trafficking, who were there.

One of them was standing next to the President. When he signed the bill, he asked whether she wanted to say anything. Fighting back tears, Yvonne Ambrose said: I want to tell you about my daughter.

She told the President about her 16-year-old daughter who was trafficked on backpage.com, a website that has most of the commercial sex traffic, and how she got a call on Christmas Eve a couple of years ago. Her daughter had been murdered. As she said, no mother

should ever have to accept or take that call.

She talked about how her daughter got dragged into this issue of trafficking and said that she hopes the legislation we passed will be able to save other daughters, other granddaughters, other Americans who otherwise would become part of the sex trafficking tragedy we have seen unfold in our country.

This legislation came out of experiences we have all had when we go back home. We talk to victims and survivors, and we have learned over the past several years that trafficking is actually on the increase in this country, in this century. People think: Well, trafficking is going on, but it happens in Africa or it happens in Asia or it happens in Latin America. It happens here. It probably happens in your community. Unfortunately, it happens in my State of Ohio way too frequently.

Through our investigation and studies of this, increasingly, we heard about online trafficking. Survivors have told me: ROB, this has moved from the street corner to the smartphone.

Groups, including the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, showed that from 2005 to 2015 there was an 800-percent increase in reports of trafficking. All of the experts agree that there is an increase in trafficking, and all agree that most of this is attributable directly to one thing—the movement to the ruthless efficiency of online selling of women and children.

One website in particular kept coming up— backpage.com, which I mentioned earlier. So we launched an investigation over a 2-year period in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. We decided to dig deep and find out what was going on, why it was happening, and what the nature of this was. What we found was shocking.

Senator CLAIRE McCASKILL of Missouri is the ranking member of the committee. She and I did this investigation, together with our committee, and we issued the report together. It was bipartisan from the start. I would say it was even nonpartisan, and it is to this day.

The investigation involved asking backpage.com for a lot of information that they were unwilling to give. We had to subpoena them, and they still refused to provide the information. We had to come to this Chamber, to the U.S. Senate, and get a vote of the entire Senate—the first time in 21 years we had to do this—to be able to enforce these subpoenas. Every Member of this body got engaged and involved in this, and by the end of the process, we had a unanimous vote from the Senate to say: Yes, you should be able to force people to provide relevant information to the committees that are doing oversight, like ours.

We got permission to enforce it, which meant potential criminal sanctions, and they still wouldn't give us

information. They fought us at the district level. They lost there. Then they fought us at the circuit level. We fought and won there. Then they fought us at the Supreme Court of the United States. We had to take it all the way to the Supreme Court.

Then, yes, they did provide us with about a million documents. They still refused to testify. They took the Fifth. But they did provide us with the documents because they had to under the threat of penalty of law. Through those documents, we found out something shocking, which was that not only were they selling women and girls online and making a lot of money doing it, but they were purposely selling underage girls and trying to hide the fact that they were doing it. Think about that. They were not only selling girls and women online, but they were taking ads for underage girls, knowing they were underage and running the ads anyway.

In fact, they would go to the people who were trying to place the ads and say: You know what, you need to change this word. You can't use the word "schoolgirl" because this indicates the girl is underage. You can't use the word "cheerleader" because that shows that she is underage. You can't use the word "Lolita," which is a novel about a young girl being trafficked and an older man.

You can't use the description of the girl and put her age in there if she is underage, but they want your ad anyway. They edited the ads, so they were complicit in this.

You would think a prosecutor would be able to go after these people, right? They are engaged in illegal activity online. If that activity were happening offline, on the street corner in your community, it would be illegal. When the prosecutors went after these people online and when the victims of trafficking, like the woman I talked about earlier whose 16-year-old daughter was murdered while she was being trafficked on backpage—when they went after backpage in that case, they were unsuccessful. Why? Because they said: Yes, Desiree died. Yes, Desiree would have a lawsuit here, as well as other women and families who came to testify before us. Kubiiki Pride is one, and her daughter was there today. But there is a Federal law that says: We, the courts, can't even take up this case because the Federal law provides an immunity, a shield, to these websites. Unbelievable.

We had a court in Sacramento last year actually tell Congress, basically: Please change this law. They said: We can't stop this exploitation—this alleged exploitation of women and girls. We can't stop it because Congress has passed a law that protects these websites. No one can go after them.

The more we learned, the more we dug, the more we found out what was really going on, we determined that our report, which you can see here—and I encourage you to check out this

report. You can find it online. "Backpage" is the search, and look on Portman.senate.gov. Go to Portman.individuals.gov, and you will see this report, if you are interested in it. The summaries will help. What it says, basically, is that they are trafficking these individuals, and they know they are doing it. Yet they are immune.

Once we determined that was our issue, we determined it was time for us to figure out legislation to actually change our Federal law that was permitting it. The culmination of that was today when the President of the United States signed that into law.

For a couple of years, we had quite a legislative struggle because there were a lot of individuals who said: Well, you can't touch these internet companies because of this law.

The law was passed 21 years ago, at the infancy of the internet. It was well-intentioned, but I do not believe that any Member of this body intended, when they passed that law, to say that you should be able to traffic people online knowingly and not pay some consequence for it, not be accountable for it.

We made a very narrow carve-out for trafficking of individuals online. We made sure that it was consistent with the Federal criminal law that was already in place if you were to do it offline. We ensured that there was a Good Samaritan provision so that if a website was in good faith trying to clean up its site and edit its site and get this information off of it, they would not be liable. That Good Samaritan or safe harbor provision was in our legislation. We proceeded to get it passed.

We had a lot of pushback, particularly from the tech community—not everybody in the tech community but certain people who believe strongly that this legislation was somehow a threat to internet freedom. I do not believe that to this day. I believe it is targeted, it is responsible, and it certainly is an issue on which you would think everybody would agree.

Just because you are online does not mean you are not accountable and responsible for selling people online—again, in the context of more and more trafficking in this country. As you look into it, you determine that is because of this online presence, the ruthless efficiency of the online selling of women and children.

We were able to bring it to the floor for a vote after a committee process. We went through the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. We went through the Commerce Committee. At the end of the day, we got a vote in this Chamber of 97 to 2. That rarely happens around here—rarely, if ever. Again, today, finally, the President signed the bill.

It looks like it was easier to do at the end. I will tell you, a couple of years ago, we were told: This will never happen. You can't make this happen. You can't beat us. We have a lot of

power. We have a lot lobbyists. We have a lot of abilities to stop you in the committee.

Yet, through persuasion and, frankly, through the personal testimony of victims and survivors who were willing to come forward and courageously share their stories, we were able to prevail. Today, it was a victory—not for this body, not for the legislative process, but it was a victory for those victims and those survivors.

One mom told me today: This means my granddaughter won't have to worry about this issue. It means that when my kid goes to the mall, I don't have to worry as much about what might happen, who might try to take her into this web of trafficking.

My hope is that this legislation will be able to curb the online trafficking in a significant way. We are already seeing the results of that. I was told today, in fact, that websites that trafficked people online are shutting down all over America because they don't want to be sued, because they are losing their immunity. It is not affecting the freedom of the internet, but it is affecting those evil websites that were engaged in criminal activity and hiding behind section 230 of the Communications Decency Act. I am told that as many as 80 percent of those trafficking websites have shut down just in the last several days because they don't want to be subject to these lawsuits.

We also had something else that was very interesting happen this week. The Department of Justice went after backpage.com. They actually indicted seven individuals. If you look at the indictment, which I have here—you can find this by going on the Justice Department website, I am sure; it is in the district court in Arizona—you will see that they named seven individuals. These are the same seven individuals we named in our report. They also used the information from our report about the fact that backpage was changing ads, editing ads. In other words, they were knowingly allowing ads about underage girls to be run because they wanted the profits. That is exactly what is talked about in this indictment.

The work of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations was very important because it enabled us to provide to the Justice Department information they used for these indictments. We provided that information 10 months ago, and the indictments came out in the last several days.

My hope is that now, because this law passed, we will see a lot more prosecutions because we have now allowed State prosecutors and attorneys general around the country and local prosecutors, district attorneys, and county prosecutors—who are the ones who ultimately are going to be much more effective and more able to go after this kind of activity—to do so.

Backpage has been in existence for 14 years. Until this week, the Federal

Justice Department had not made these indictments. It was great that they did it. It is also about time, in my view. Now we have this tool to allow other prosecutors to be more aggressive, to do what should have been done years ago—to save the lives of so many girls, women, and boys whose lives have been taken off track because of the trauma associated with this. We also now have the opportunity for the victims themselves to file lawsuits.

This is already having a chilling effect. In other words, it is already taking down these websites that don't want to be sued. They know our legislation—although very narrowly crafted—applies to them because they are knowingly involved in, supporting, assisting sex trafficking.

I think this is a victory for the victims, the survivors, and, maybe most importantly, the potential future victims. It is also an opportunity for us to celebrate something that this Chamber accomplished in a bipartisan way, going through the right process, doing the research, coming up with the facts, narrowly crafting legislation that works, which doesn't have a negative impact, but in fact, it helps to change behavior. We are already seeing it.

My hope is that we will do more of that around here. We have many other issues to address. Earlier, we talked about the opioid crisis. Congress passed some good legislation, but we need to do more.

We have an issue with getting people back to work who are in the shadows of our economy, some of whom have a felony record, some of whom are addicted to opioids, some of whom don't have the skills to engage in a modern economy. That is a huge challenge. To me, it is unbelievable that we have so many people who are in our country but not in our labor force. Our labor force participation rate, as economists call it, is as low as it has ever been for men in the history of our country. There are probably 9 million men between 25 and 55 who are able-bodied and not working today. That is wrong.

There are many issues we need to address. If we can do those studies in the same way and come up with sensible solutions based on research, based on good practices, keep it not just bipartisan but nonpartisan, and say: Let's get the politics out of this, and let's try to figure out how to help people—which is our job around here; that is what we were elected to do—maybe we can make progress in a number of different areas.

Today, at the signing ceremony for this legislation, the SESTA legislation, I had the opportunity to see a friend of mine, Theresa Flores, who runs a group called Save Our Adolescents From Prostitution, S.O.A.P. the reason she uses the acronym S.O.A.P. is that Theresa, who is a survivor—she was trafficked years ago and now has a passion for this issue. She calls her organization S.O.A.P. because she goes to major events around the country, sporting

events, where there tend to be an increase in trafficking. What she does is she goes to the hotels and asks them to put a bar of soap in the bathroom. On that bar of soap, she has listed the national hotline for sex trafficking. A girl can call that number and have someone come rescue her, and she can escape from her trafficker.

That simple act of making these bars of soap and getting hotels to place them in these bathrooms has been remarkably effective. Think about it. These girls or women may have no other time where they have privacy, where they don't have the trafficker with them, where they are not feeling under duress. When they have their private moment in the bathroom, they see the number. Many of them have called that number and have been able to escape this life and get back to a productive life, with treatment, with support, with the kind of longer term recovery that is needed to get through the trauma, to get through, in many cases, the drug addiction. Drugs are involved in this, as you can imagine, as a way to make these women, girls, and boys dependent. In fact, in Ohio, unfortunately, that is a common practice, is that drugs are involved.

Theresa Flores has done something incredible. She has channeled her frustration and all of the trauma she went through into something very constructive. She was there today, and her comment to me was that, by this act, by passing this law, we are going to save lives, and we are going to enable future generations to not go down the tragic and dark road she had to go down. That should make us feel good in this Chamber. It should make us feel good for those whose lives can be helped through this and for those victims to at least have the opportunity to have their day in court, to be able to seek justice.

I thank the President of the United States for signing the legislation today. I thank Ivanka Trump in particular for her support on the legislation all along the way. I hope this legislation will be a model for others to come.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 2018

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:15 a.m., Thursday, April 12; 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 executive session and resume consideration of the Pizzella nomination under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:15 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. PERDUE. 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 6:54 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, April 12, 2018, at 9:15 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 11, 2018:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

JOHN F. RING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2022.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MR. JARED KING

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable young man, Jared John King who attained the Eagle Scout Award. Becoming an Eagle Scout, the highest rank in the Boy Scouts, has only been accomplished by approximately four percent of all Boy Scouts. The process requires earning at least 21 merit badges which takes years to fulfill.

At the age of 15 and a freshman in high school, Mr. King should be proud of his accomplishment. Receiving his Eagle Scout rank demonstrates that he is a strong, dedicated, and proven leader. With this accomplishment, it is my hope he will continue to serve as a role model for younger boy scouts. Thank you to Mr. King for making a positive impact in northeast Iowa.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF U.S. NAVY
SEAL RICHARD PAUL MELTON

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an American hero and one of Eastern Kentucky's bravest sons, U.S. Navy SEAL Richard Paul Melton, in celebration of his retirement from a valiant 20-year military career.

As a member of the nation's elite Seal Team Six, Paul Melton has served as one of the United States' highly trained experts in warfare, special reconnaissance, counterterrorism and national defense. Our Navy SEALs are the most highly esteemed warriors around the world, known for their unmatched success in covert special operations by sea, air and land, displaying incredible dedication to our country with every mission and unmatched willpower in enemy territory.

Our nation owes this Navy SEAL and his family a great debt of gratitude for their combined sacrifice during his brave service over the last two decades. He has served five tours in Afghanistan, as well as tours in the Arabian Peninsula, the Horn of Africa and the greater Middle East. While we may never know the gravity of his classified missions and the imminent danger he faced in areas infiltrated with some of the world's most brutal terrorists, let us never fail to applaud and recognize his undying determination to defend our freedom and protect our allied nations.

Senior Chief Petty Officer Paul Melton is decorated with some of the highest honors bestowed upon any member of the U.S. Armed Forces, including: five Bronze Star Medals with Combat V, a Purple Heart, a Joint Service Commendation Medal with Combat V, a

Combat Action Ribbon, two Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals, three Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medals, two Presidential Unit Citations, a Meritorious Unit Commendation Medal, the Navy E Ribbon, six Navy Good Conduct Medals, a National Defense Medal, an Afghanistan Campaign Medal, a Sea Service Deployment Medal, a Navy Rifle Expert Medal and a Navy Pistol Expert Medal.

I count it an immense honor to celebrate this true American patriot upon his retirement from the United States Naval Special Warfare Development Group—SEAL Team Six. The people of Leslie County and all of Kentucky are incredibly proud of our hometown hero, Richard Paul Melton.

HUGH BRITTENHAM

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hugh Brittenham, a fine young man from Estero High School. At the FSU relays, Hugh was able to both break his already national record setting 800-meter event time, and snag another national record for the 1,600-meter event.

I congratulate Hugh for his exceptional commitment to the Estero running program. I also extend my congratulations to Hugh's family, Estero running coaches Mike Bumpus, Ben Pignatone, Leigh Williamson, Brian Olitsky and the late former athletic director Jeff Sommer, who made the Estero running program into what it is today.

HONORING STANLEY DAVIS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a talented and driven man Mr. Stanley Davis. Mr. Davis has shown what can be done through tenacity, dedication and a desire to serve his community while having a successful career.

Stanley was born and raised in the Brickyard Hill community in Yazoo City, along with his mother and eight siblings. He attended school in Yazoo City at Main Street Elementary, and Yazoo City Junior High, before graduating from Yazoo City High School in 1986.

Stanley Davis, the manager at 49 Exxon Fuelmart on Jerry Clower Boulevard in Yazoo City, is known for making every customer feel important. Over the years, the name of the convenience store changed. It is still commonly referred to as Mayfield's or Texaco by many Yazoo residents. When the store owner-

ship changed hands ten years ago, from Les Mayfield to Jared Mayfield, Stanley was made the store manager because of his increasing dedication to the customers.

Stanley's aim is to make sure that all customers feel important and that they can get everything they need in one place, from gasoline and propane, snacks and drinks, and simple automotive essentials, to pizza and even hunting and fishing supplies.

Stanley is a husband and a father, and strives to instill hard work in the lives of his children. His advice to those who want a career in business management is to stay in school, read more, and always ask questions if you don't know something.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Stanley Davis for his desire to make a difference in his community.

HONORING THE LIVES AND SERVICE OF ELWOOD, INDIANA FIREFIGHTERS KYLE HIBST AND DAVID WITTKAMPER

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the lives of two outstanding public servants, Madison County volunteer firefighters Kyle Hibst and David Wittkamper who lost their lives in a plane crash on April 2, 2018. Kyle and David both were active members in their community and served as volunteer firefighters with the Pipe Creek Township.

The Pipe Creek Township Volunteer Fire Department was established in 1960 and is located in Elwood, Indiana. The department is all-volunteer and provides fire and rescue protection to more than 4,000 residents of Pipe Creek Township. As volunteer firefighters, Kyle and David donated their time to provide emergency services for Pipe Creek Township. Being a volunteer firefighter is not for the faint of heart. Those who answer the call of duty are motivated by a sense of pride in their community. The dedication and service of volunteer firefighters across Indiana is essential to the safety of our communities.

A life-long Hoosier, Kyle graduated from Elwood Community High School in 2005 and began a career in public service in 2011, when he joined the Pipe Creek Township Volunteer Fire Department. In addition to his work at the fire department, Kyle was the owner of Anytime Fitness in Elwood and also an area field manager for U-Haul. Kyle and his wife Kimberley, were married for four years. Kyle was a beloved husband and a devoted father who enjoyed spending time outdoors with his son, Grayson, and watching Notre Dame Football. In addition to his wife and son, Kyle is survived by his parents; Frederick and Rebecca Hibst; his two sisters, Kirsten Hibst and Kacie Johns, and many other loving family members.

• 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.

Raised in a family of public servants, David followed the legacy of his father and grandfather by becoming a firefighter in the same department where they had both served. David graduated from Indiana Christian Academy, in Anderson, and joined the Pipe Creek Township Volunteer Fire Department in May 2007, serving selflessly for 11 years. David was even training to become an EMT to expand his role within his community. When David wasn't volunteering, he worked as a fork lift operator at Red Gold in Elwood. David and his wife Autumn were married for 5 years; she was his soulmate. In addition to his wife, David is survived by his parents, Melvin and Darlene Wittkamper; sister, Megan (husband Chad) Welsh; brother, Devin Wittkamper, and many other loving family members.

Kyle and David will be forever missed by their families as well as their colleagues and friends in Elwood and at the Pipe Creek Township Volunteer Fire Department. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are grateful for Kyle's and David's service to our Hoosier community and it is my privilege to honor them today. On behalf of all Hoosiers, I would like to recognize Kyle and David for their impact and service to our community. I extend my deepest condolences to Kyle and David's families, the Pipe Creek Township Volunteer Fire Department, their friends, and their fellow volunteer firefighters who mourn their loss. My thoughts and prayers are with them.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call votes on Tuesday, April 10, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call votes 130 and 131, and voted Nay on Roll Call vote 132.

RETIREMENT OF ROBERT M. LIGHTFOOT, JR., ACTING ADMINISTRATOR, NASA

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the career of an outstanding civil servant who has dedicated his professional life to furthering our nation's goals in space exploration at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Robert M. Lightfoot, Jr., Acting Administrator of NASA will retire on April 20, 2018 after 29 years of service at NASA.

Mr. Lightfoot's NASA career, which began in 1989 as a test engineer and program manager for the space shuttle engine technology testbed program at the Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama, is marked by numerous leadership roles, including as: assistant associate administrator for the Space Shuttle Program at NASA Headquarters from 2003 to 2005 where he worked on space shut-

tle Return to Flight activities following the loss of Space Shuttle *Columbia* and her crew in 2003; deputy director of the Marshall Space Flight Center from 2007 to 2009, and director of the Marshall Space Flight Center from 2009 to 2012.

In 2012, Mr. Lightfoot, became associate administrator of NASA, the highest ranking civil servant position in the agency.

Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2017, following the departure of NASA Administrator Charles Bolden at the end of the Obama Administration, Mr. Lightfoot became the Acting Administrator of NASA.

Since the date he assumed the Acting Administrator role, Mr. Lightfoot has led NASA through the transition to the current Administration, through the Fiscal Year 2018 and Fiscal Year 2019 budget submissions, through Congressional budget hearings, and through the reestablishment of the National Space Council and NASA's participation therein.

Perhaps, most importantly, Mr. Lightfoot has provided steadfast leadership of NASA's programs, including the development of the Space Launch System and Orion crew vehicle, the commercial crew program that will reestablish U.S. human spaceflight capability to low-Earth orbit, the development of the James Webb Space Telescope and Mars 2020 flagship science projects, the commencement of the aeronautics x-plane project, and the continued advancements in space technologies that will enable future NASA missions.

The nation is fortunate to have had such a committed, experienced, and technically knowledgeable leader at the helm of NASA for what has become the longest Acting Administrator period in the agency's history.

Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that Robert Lightfoot has received numerous prestigious awards and accolades for his service to NASA, engineering, and civil space, including the Presidential Rank Award for Distinguished Executives, the highest honor for Federal government work. However, like the NASA workforce he leads, Mr. Lightfoot never forgets that he is part of a team.

In an interview with NASA Tech Briefs in May, 2010, Mr. Lightfoot said, "Spaceflight is very much a team sport, and being part of these teams, whether it was running engine tests, whether it was return to flight, whether it's working through problems associated with anything we're working on, if I can do that, that's what an engineer does. But you rarely do it by yourself. I have been very fortunate to be part of some tremendous teams, and the higher up I've moved, there are still teams there . . . they're just different."

For his excellence in engineering contributions to NASA, for his 29 years of dedication to furthering the nation's goals in civil space, and for his outstanding leadership of NASA through an extended period as Acting Administrator, I extend my deepest thanks and appreciation, and send my best wishes to Robert M. Lightfoot, Jr. as he retires from Federal government service and embarks on the next chapter of his life.

CONGRESS OF FUTURE MEDICAL LEADERS

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 13 high school students who were chosen by the National Academy of Future Physicians and Medical Scientists to represent the State of Colorado as Delegates at the Congress of Future Medical Leaders. These students are Madeline Brummet, Joslyn Burnett, Dalton Duncan, Bergen Evans, Devyn Kincade, Jack Lewis, Caitlyn Lutters, Owen Richardson, Giovanna Rubio, Dallas Snow, Kimberlee Sukle, Aleigh Trimble, and Jordan Wieck.

The Congress is an honors-only program for top students in our country who aspire to be physicians or medical scientists. These students are nominated by their teachers or the Academy based on their leadership ability, academic achievement, and dedication. This program is designed to inspire young people to go into medical research fields or be physicians, and provides a path, plan, and mentoring resources to help them reach their goal. During the Congress, the students will have the chance to learn from leaders in the medical field as well as government officials, top medical school deans, leaders from the private sector, and even Nobel laureates.

These students' acceptance to this prestigious program is an incredible feat, and it is my honor to rise today and recognize the outstanding accomplishment of this future leader. Our nation greatly benefits from the achievements of physicians and medical scientists, and it is important that we continue to inspire younger generations to pursue careers in the medical field.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my congratulations to these students and wish them the best in their future endeavors.

SERGEANT GONZALEZ

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Sammy Gonzalez. A Lee County Sheriff's Office deputy since 2007, he has made an incredible commitment to run from their headquarters in Fort Myers to the Fallen Officer Memorial in Tallahassee, Florida.

This effort, a run of approximately 400 miles, is being made on behalf of family members left behind following the on-duty death of a law enforcement officer. Sergeant Gonzalez is raising funds and awareness for Concerns of Police Survivors (C.O.P.S.), a not-for-profit organization that assists the families of fallen officers. C.O.P.S. pays for counseling, summer camp, and other programs for family members of officers killed in the line of duty.

This nine-day run, which the Sergeant refers to as the "Run for the Fallen," will require Gonzalez to cover approximately 45 miles each day. The venture, in its entirety, equates

to the completion of over 15 consecutive marathons. Good luck and Godspeed.

HONORING RONALD LOUTHERBACK

HON. DANA ROHRBACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, Corona Del Mar resident Ronald Louthierback passed on April 5, 2018 from heart failure. Ron was a deeply religious person, a kind and outgoing man who was an American patriot to the core and actively supported conservative events. He leaves his wife Therese Louthierback, children Lonnie and Debra, three grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. Ron is best known for being the founder and president of THE WINE CLUB, premium discount wine retail stores that earned the honor by Southern Wine and Spirits magazine as being the best premier wine shops in the United States. His shops were located in Santa Ana, San Francisco, and Santa Clara since 1985, and were sold in 2000. Ron had belonged to the Sunny Hills Tennis Club, the Newport Beach Tennis Club, and the Santa Ana Country Club. He lived life to the fullest and was loved by all. He will be truly missed.

HONORING MR. JORDAN MCGAUGHEY ON RECEIVING THE MILKEN EDUCATOR AWARD

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Jordan McGaughey on receiving the Milken Educator Award.

This award was established in 1987 by the Milken Family Foundation to attract, retain, and motivate the finest teaching talent to continue the good work of molding young minds. The Milken Educator Award has been hailed as the "Oscars of Teaching" and provides public recognition and financial rewards to those who have the honor of receiving the award.

Jordan earned his bachelor's degree in History in 2007 and his master's in Education in 2008 from Truman State University. He now teaches American government classes at Seckman High School in Imperial, Missouri where he has shown outstanding commitment to his students, fellow educators, and the community. His classes stress the importance of valuing diversity, debating hot topics, and using critical thinking to formulate a personal opinion. Students have the opportunity to become more involved in the legislative process when they write their legislators, and in one particular lesson, they develop, present, discuss, and vote on "new" constitutional amendments. Jordan's students consistently perform above district and state averages and many have gone on to careers in government and education.

To foster an enjoyable learning environment, Jordan uses numerous teaching styles. By rotating between cooperative learning activities, collaborative inquiry-based learning,

and traditional lectures, he is able to engage and interact with students effectively. As a Google Certified Educator, he also incorporates Google Classroom, Socrative, and Kaboot technology into his lessons. These education tools create other avenues for students to learn skills that will positively impact their future career choices. In this age of social media, Jordan also utilizes live debates on Twitter to engage students during events like the State of the Union.

In addition to his successful career in the classroom, Jordan serves on the district's professional development team and on the American Government curriculum committee. He also mentors student teachers and serves as an instructional coach, giving future teachers the opportunity to learn from someone who is motivated, passionate, and driven. Lastly, Jordan serves the community even further as a member of the Missouri Council for Social Studies and the St. Louis Teacher Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing Mr. Jordan McGaughey on this great honor.

RECOGNIZING THE NORTHEAST INDIANA BASE COMMUNITY COUNCIL

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Northeast Indiana Base Community Council and its annual Race for the Warrior. Across eleven counties in northeast Indiana, the NIBCC is working with over 30 community groups, making my district one of America's most engaged regions when it comes to supporting our military.

The Race for the Warrior is the hallmark for the NIBCC. In its fourth year, proceeds from the event raise funds for the NIBCC Military Support Fund. This fund provides one-time grants to local military members for emergency relief, as well as other military and veterans support programs.

I am proud of the work the NIBCC does on behalf of our active duty servicemembers, veterans, and their families in my district.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL STOP THE BLEED DAY

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the ability to recognize and effectively assist life-threatening bleeding in someone can save a life. On March 31, 2018, the country came together to recognize National Stop the Bleed Day. Stop the Bleed is a program that is offered by the American College of Surgeons to teach people how to become an immediate responder to victims suffering from uncontrolled bleeding by 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, indus-

trial and farm accidents, shootings, and natural disasters. The most common preventable cause of these deaths is a victim losing too much blood in the mere minutes before trained responders arrive. Just like CPR training, being able to recognize and care for a traumatic injury can prevent victims from bleeding out. I was among the 126,000 that were trained last year on how to Stop the Bleed and I hope to inspire others to join me in supporting this program.

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, I missed Roll Call votes No. 130 and 131. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call 130 related to the End Banking for Human Traffickers Act of 2018, and YEA on Roll Call 131 relating to the Combat Online Predators Act.

HONORING THE 2017 FELLOWS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF INVENTORS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 155 inventors who will soon be inducted as the 2017 Fellows of the National Academy of Inventors (NAI). To be named as Fellows, these men and women were nominated by their peers and underwent the scrutiny of the NAI Selection Committee, having had their innovations deemed as making a significant impact on quality of life, economic development, and welfare of society. Their induction ceremony here in the nation's capital will feature a keynote address by U.S. Commissioner for Patents, Andrew Hirshfeld.

Collectively, this elite group holds nearly 6,000 patents. The individuals making up this year's class of Fellows include individuals from 124 research universities and non-profit research institutes spanning the United States and the world. The group of Fellows, now 912 in total, is composed of more than 100 presidents and senior leaders of research universities and non-profit research institutes, 439 members of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; twenty-eight inductees of the National Inventors Hall of Fame, fifty-two recipients of the U.S. National Medal of Technology and Innovation and U.S. National Medal of Science; twenty-nine Nobel Laureates; 261 AAAS Fellows; 168 IEEE Fellows; and 142 Fellows of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences, among other awards and distinctions. The NAI was founded in 2010 to recognize and encourage inventors with patents issued from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, enhance the visibility of academic technology and innovation, encourage the disclosure of intellectual

property, educate and mentor innovative students, and translate the inventions of its members to benefit society.

All Americans are greatly indebted to innovators such as these for contributions to our country and the world through their work. I commend these individuals, as well as the organizations and taxpayers that make their work possible, for all they do to revolutionize the world in which we live. I hope attention brought to this round of inductions will encourage future generations to strive to meet this high honor and continue the spirit of discovery and innovation.

The 2017 NAI Fellows include:

Samuel I. Achilefu, Washington University in St. Louis; Dereje Agonafer, The University of Texas at Arlington; Mark G. Allen, University of Pennsylvania; James P. Allison, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center; Hiroshi Amano, Nagoya University; Richard R. Anderson, Massachusetts General Hospital; Leif Andersson, Texas A&M University and Uppsala University; J. Roger P. Angel, The University of Arizona; Diran Apelian, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; Plamen B. Atanassov, The University of New Mexico; Craig H. Benson, University of Virginia; Cory J. Berkland, The University of Kansas; Vijayakumar Bhagavatula, Carnegie Mellon University; David J. Bishop, Boston University; Donald L. Bitzer, North Carolina State University; Randy D. Blakely, Florida Atlantic University; Helen M. Blau, Stanford University; Timothy M. Block, Baruch S. Blumberg Institute; Daniel J. Blumenthal, University of California, Santa Barbara; Susmita Bose, Washington State University; Steven T. Boyce, University of Cincinnati; Edward S. Boyden, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Anthony B. Brennan, University of Florida; Carrie L. Byington, Texas A&M University; Marvin H. Caruthers, University of Colorado Boulder; Dennis S. Charney, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai; Yang-Tse Cheng, University of Kentucky; Yet Ming Chiang, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Joanne Chory, Salk Institute for Biological Studies; Mooi Choo Chuah, Lehigh University; David E. Clemmer, Indiana University; Geofrey W. Coates, Cornell University; Stanley N. Cohen, Stanford University; James E. Crowe Jr., Vanderbilt University Medical Center; Pieter Cullis, The University of British Columbia; Mari Dezawa, Tohoku University; William L. Ditto, North Carolina State University; Prabir K. Dutta, The Ohio State University; Jack A. Elias, Brown University; Zhigang Z. Fang, The University of Utah; Tim A. Fischell, Michigan State University and Western Michigan University; Paul B. Fisher, Virginia Commonwealth University; Edward P. Furlani, University at Buffalo, SUNY; Guangping Gao, University of Massachusetts Medical School; Suresh V. Garimella, Purdue University; Bruce E. Gnade, Southern Methodist University; Lawrence Gold, University of Colorado Boulder; Sheila A. Grant, University of Missouri, Columbia; Mark A. Griswold, Case Western Reserve University; Horng-Jyh Harn, Hualien Tzu Chi Hospital; Robert W. Heath, Jr., The University of Texas at Austin; Walter Brown Herbst, Northwestern University; Mark C. Hersam, Northwestern University; David M. Holtzman, Washington University in St. Louis; Ming Hsieh, University of Southern California; Ian W. Hunter, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mikko Hupa, Åbo Akademi University; Oliver C. Ibe, University of Massachu-

setts, Lowell; Eric D. Isaacs, The University of Chicago; Subramanian S. Iyer, University of California, Los Angeles; Joseph A. Izatt, Duke University; William R. Jacobs Jr., Albert Einstein College of Medicine; Rakesh K. Jain, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard University; Stephen Albert Johnston, Arizona State University; Ranu Jung, Florida International University; Brian L. Justus, U.S. Naval Research Laboratory; Alexander V. Kabanov, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Aravinda Kar, University of Central Florida; Kazunori Kataoka, The University of Tokyo; Howard E. Katz, Johns Hopkins University; Arie E. Kaufman, Stony Brook University, SUNY; Donald B. Keck, University of South Florida; Jeffery W. Kelly, The Scripps Research Institute; David V. Kerns Jr., Olin College of Engineering; Robert S. Keynton, University of Louisville; Dennis K. Killinger, University of South Florida; Kwang J. Kim, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Wayne H. Knox, University of Rochester; Philip T. Kortum, Rice University; Philip T. Krein, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; John J. La Scala, U.S. Army Research Laboratory; Jonathan J. Langberg, Emory University; Sang Yup Lee, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology; Fred C. Lee, Virginia Tech; Eric C. Leuthardt, Washington University in St. Louis; Nathan S. Lewis, California Institute of Technology; Tsu-Jae King Liu, University of California, Berkeley; Chih-Yuan Lu, National Taiwan University; Zhenqiang Ma, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Michele Marcolongo, Drexel University; Laura Marcu, University of California, Davis; R. Kenneth Marcus, Clemson University; Gary S. Margules, Nova Southeastern University; Mary Helen McCay, Florida Institute of Technology; Kishor C. Mehta, Texas Tech University; Deirdre R. Meldrum, Arizona State University; Bhubaneswar Mishra, New York University; Gregory Moller, University of Idaho; Clayton Daniel Mote, Jr., University of Maryland; Shouleh Nikzad, NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory; John R. Nottingham, Case Western Reserve University and Cleveland Clinic; Mariappan P. Paranthaman, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; Christopher R. Parish, The Australian National University; Peter L.T. Pirolli, Florida Institute for Human and Machine Cognition; Daniel A. Portnoy, University of California, Berkeley; Dennis W. Prather, University of Delaware; Paul R. Prucnal, Princeton University; Nirmala Ramanujam, Duke University; Jennifer L. Rexford, Princeton University; Kenner C. Rice, National Institutes of Health; Camillo Ricordi, University of Miami; Gabriel Alfonso Rincon-Mora, Georgia Institute of Technology; Bruce R. Rosen, Massachusetts General Hospital; Barbara O. Rothbaum, Emory University; Jonathan M. Rothberg, Yale University; Max F. Rothschild, Iowa State University; Clinton T. Rubin, Stony Brook University, SUNY; Shelly Sakiyama-Elbert, The University of Texas at Austin; Henry Samueli, University of California, Los Angeles and University of California, Irvine; Ulrich S. Schubert, Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena; Paul A. Seib, Kansas State University; Terrence J. Sejnowski, Salk Institute for Biological Studies; Mohammad Shahidehpour, Illinois Institute of Technology; Yun-Qing Shi, New Jersey Institute of Technology; Subhash L. Shinde, University of Notre Dame; Richard W. Siegel, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Krishna P. Singh, University of Pennsylvania;

Hyongsok T. Soh, Stanford University; Steven L. Stice, University of Georgia; Steven L. Suib, University of Connecticut; Russell H. Taylor, Johns Hopkins University; Jeffrey A. Toretzky, Georgetown University; Rocky S. Tuan, University of Pittsburgh and The Chinese University of Hong Kong; Robert Vince, University of Minnesota; Andrew J. Viterbi, University of Southern California; Tuan Vo-Dinh, Duke University; Scott A. Waldman, Thomas Jefferson University; Thomas A. Waldmann, National Cancer Institute; Peter Walter, University of California, San Francisco; Fei Wang, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Scott C. Weaver, The University of Texas Medical Branch; Thomas J. Webster, Northeastern University; Chin-Long Wey, National Chiao Tung University; Lorne Whitehead, The University of British Columbia; Cheryl L. Willman, The University of New Mexico; Alan N. Willson, Jr., University of California, Los Angeles; Teresa K. Woodruff, Northwestern University; Amy E. Wright, Florida Atlantic University; Eli Yablonovitch, University of California, Berkeley; Paul Yager, University of Washington; Jackie Y. Ying, Institute of Bioengineering and Nanotechnology; Bin Yu, SUNY Polytechnic Institute; Mona E. Zaghoul, The George Washington University; Zeev Zalevsky, Bar-Ilan University; Lynn Zechiedrich, Baylor College of Medicine.

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating these new NAI Fellows.

HONORING CAROL JOHNSON-BURGER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Carol Johnson-Burger who was named the first woman and African American President and CEO of United Way of the Capital Area in Jackson, Mississippi in July, 1995. Born in Jefferson Davis County, Mississippi, she graduated from Tougaloo College and was very involved in the Civil Rights Movement in Mississippi, having the opportunity to meet and work with Medgar Evers and Dr. Martin Luther King. Carol was the first Black teacher to integrate the public schools in Pearl River County, Mississippi, one of the most racist counties in Mississippi at the time.

Carol is active in her community and on the national and international levels with United Way Worldwide. She has served on many boards including co-chairing with former Governor William Winter, the process that created a strategic plan for the City of Jackson and as vice chair of the Secretary of the State's Non-profit and Charities Laws study group. She is a founding member of the Central Mississippi Chapter of 100 Black Women and the Mississippi Chapter of the International Women Forum. She serves on the Executive Committee of the National Professional Council for United Way Worldwide and as a mentor to United Way Professionals in South Africa.

She is the recipient of many awards but her greatest joy is being "Grammie" to her grandkids Nicholas and Logan. She, her son Marcus and the grandkids are active members of Anderson United Methodist Church.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Carol Johnson-Burger for her dedication to serving others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call 130, Yea on Roll Call 131, and Yea on Roll Call 132.

NATIONAL LAWN CARE MONTH

HON. ANDY HARRIS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize April as national lawn care month. The landscape industry employs nearly 1 million workers and contributes annual revenue of \$78 billion to our nation's economy. From the National Mall to an opening day outfield and even in our own front and back yards, images of beautiful lawns are iconic depictions of American culture and the American dream.

As we recognize these images, we must also recognize the work that goes into the upkeep of such lawns. Landscape and lawn care professionals play a vital role in ensuring that lawns are not only maintained but also healthy. Healthy grass and turf deliver essential benefits to families, communities, and the environment.

Healthy lawns offer protection against disease carrying insects. They provide oxygen, protect our waterways, and clean the air. They are the backdrop for important life memories such as first steps, athletic accomplishments, and gatherings for friends and families. Healthy lawns are important parts of our communities.

CONGRESS OF FUTURE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY LEADERS

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 9 high school students who were chosen by the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists to represent the State of Colorado as Delegates at the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders. The students are Daniela Arenas Berenste, Carter Brand, Benjamin Davis, Evelyn Esparza, Denita Guimaraes-Paez, Amanda Rees, Yoselin Thompson, Alex Truitt, and Christopher Zavakos.

The Congress is an honors-only program for top students in our country who aspire to work in science, technology, engineering, or math (STEM) fields. These students are nominated by their teachers or the Academy based on their leadership ability, academic achievement,

and dedication. This program is designed to inspire young people to go into STEM fields and provides a path, plan, and mentoring resources to help them reach their dreams. During the Congress, the students will have the chance to learn from luminaries of the STEM field including top scientific university deans, leaders from government and the private sector, and even Nobel laureates.

These students' acceptance to this prestigious program is an incredible feat, and it is my honor to rise today and recognize the outstanding accomplishment of this future leader. Our nation greatly benefits from the achievements of scientists and technologists, and it is important that we continue to inspire younger generations to pursue careers in the STEM fields.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my congratulations to these students and wish them the best in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CLARK COUNTY MUSEUM

HON. JACKY ROSEN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th anniversary of the oldest and largest museum in the Las Vegas Valley.

On April 20, 2018, the Clark County Museum will celebrate 50 years of engaging visitors, and creating a deeper understanding and enjoyment of history and culture.

The first public museum in the Las Vegas Valley, in the last fifty years the Clark County Museum has moved, changed names, and become a pre-eminent location for learning about the history of Southern Nevada. It now has a collection of more than 1 million artifacts, and has become a true reflection of the story of Southern Nevadans.

I am a proud supporter of the important work museums are doing in our districts. That is why I requested robust funding for the Institute of Museum and Library Services' (IMLS) Office of Museum Services (OMS) from House appropriators and was pleased to see it included in this year's spending package.

I want to congratulate the Clark County Museum on reaching this impressive milestone. Thank the museum staff and supporters for their contributions to help preserve Southern Nevada's history and culture, and I look forward to seeing all that they accomplish in the next 50 years.

RECOGNIZING THE HIGHLAND HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY DANCE TEAM

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Highland High School varsity dance team, who are the 2018 Illinois High School Association Competitive Dance Class 1A champions.

Highland won the title with a score of 95.08, making this the school's third dance team championship in a row. Highland ended the preliminary round with a three-point advantage and then secured the win by posting the highest team score of Head Coach Emily Wellen's tenure. The victory was especially exciting to seniors Olivia Genteman, Abigail Rogier, Kayla Davis and Katie Etter, who now claim the title of three-peat champions.

I would like to congratulate the entire Highland dance team on their victory: Kayla Davis, Bree Etherton, Katie Etter, Alexis Finely, Paige Foster, Olivia Genteman, Kylie McFarland, Abbey Mortland, Claire Pabst, Abigail Rogier, Tatum Stock and Brooke Wilson, as well as Coach Wellen, on a superb end to a great season.

Mr. Speaker, today it is an honor for me to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of the Highland High School varsity dance team in winning the 2018 championship, and I wish the team, and their coach, all the best in the future.

HONORING EXCLUSIVE KUTZ BARBER SHOP

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Exclusive Kutz Barber Shop, a Yazoo City business making an impact not only on hairstyles, but also on the needy of the community.

Oliver Sampson, owner of Exclusive Kutz, along with Steve Beckford and Lonnie Conley, create lasting impressions on customers by providing them with popular or custom hairstyles.

Exclusive Kutz is proud to service men, women, and children of all cultures, providing the best experiences possible for their customers.

Barber shops are known for their conversations, and Sampson reflected on the variety of talks that have occurred in his shop, ranging from politics and religion, to economics and fiancés.

Exclusive Kutz was recently featured in an issue of The Yazoo Herald giving free haircuts and facials to the needy of Yazoo City at the Manna House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Exclusive Kutz Barber Shop and its owners for their desire to make a difference in the lives of children and the community.

RECOGNIZING MR. PJ KEELER FOR BEING NAMED THE RECIPIENT OF THE GOOD SCOUT AWARD

HON. JOHN J. FASO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound respect that I rise today to recognize and celebrate Mr. PJ Keeler for being named the Twin Rivers Council, Boy Scouts of America recipient of the Good Scout Award. This designation is reserved for those distinctive members

of our community who exhibit the values of scouting and are a force for good.

Mr. Keeler has distinguished himself as a cornerstone of the Columbia County community. Through his innovative thinking as Columbia County Treasurer and his decades-long participation in the volunteer fire department and ambulance service, Mr. Keeler has improved the quality of life for the county's many residents. His tireless dedication to Columbia County and the compassion he shows toward his friends and neighbors has made him a role model within the community for young generations to follow.

Mr. Keeler's legacy of hard work is a source of inspiration, instilling the values of determination, confidence, and civility in his community. I am grateful for Mr. Keeler's years of dedicated service to Columbia County and to New York state.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on H.R. 2219, the End Banking for Human Traffickers Act of 2018 (Roll no. 130), which would increase the role of the financial industry in combating human trafficking, I would have voted "aye."

Additionally, had I been present for the vote on H.R. 4203, the Combat Online Predators Act (Roll no. 131), which would amend title 18 of United States Code with regard to stalking, I would have voted "aye."

Finally, had I been present for the vote on approving the Journal (Roll no. 132), I would have voted "aye."

HONORING DR. STEVEN WILLIAMS

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Steven Williams, one of Albuquerque's leading HIV physicians and researchers, who will retire this year after more than two decades of serving our community.

In the early 1990s, the Albuquerque community had few doctors who were willing and able to take on patients with HIV. That was until Dr. Williams organized a team of physicians and nurses at the University of New Mexico Hospital to provide those diagnosed with the virus with emotional support, testing, and survival education. Over time, Dr. Williams built this practice into an outstanding specialty clinic within the hospital called the Truman Clinic. In addition to providing high quality medical care, Dr. Williams and his team have also supported fundraising and provided guidance to local organizations supporting HIV patients.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of New Mexico's First Congressional District, I want to thank Dr. Steven Williams for his years of service to our community, and congratulate him on his well-deserved retirement. We wish him nothing but the best in all his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL ROOFING CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL ROOFING WEEK

HON. RANDY HULTGREN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Roofing Contractors Association (NRCA), headquartered in Rosemont, IL, and its efforts to designate the week of June 3–9, 2018 as National Roofing Week.

The roof is one of the most important components of any home or business. It is the first line of defense against natural elements, such as rain, snow or wind, and yet it is often taken for granted until it falls into disrepair. National Roofing Week honors the thousands of roofing contractors and roofing-related businesses across the country and the industry's commitment to public service. National Roofing Week is a valuable reminder of the significance quality roofing has on every home and business in the United States.

Established in 1886, NRCA is one of the nation's oldest trade associations and the voice of professional roofing contractors worldwide. Today, the NRCA has more than 3,800 members located across all 50 states and represents a variety of industry stakeholders, including roofing, roof deck, and water proofing contractors. Utilizing its vast network of roofing contractors and industry-related members, NRCA is responsible for the installation of a majority of new construction and replacement roof systems on commercial and residential structures in America. Most of its members are small, privately held businesses that provide high-paying jobs for thousands of hard-working families and individuals that are the backbone of our economy.

Professional roofing contractors provide vital services to their communities, both on and off the clock, in all 50 states. NRCA members will recognize National Roofing Week on June 3–9 by supporting numerous charitable community service roofing projects throughout the nation. I commend the NRCA and the vital role the organization and its members play in every community and I ask all my colleagues to join me in acknowledging their contributions during National Roofing Week.

RECOGNIZING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF TARTAN DAY

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the 20th anniversary of Tartan day on April 6th along with the many accomplishments of Scottish Americans in my district.

I am a proud member of the Friends of Scotland Caucus and am well aware of the deep history of Scottish immigrants in Philadelphia. As Scotland witnessed a tumultuous 18th century, Scots turned to Philadelphia to pursue a better life. During early settlements, Philadelphia was largely used as a gateway to the United States. Demand for a unifying orga-

nization grew and consequently, the St. Andrew's Society of Philadelphia was formed in 1747 by twenty-five Scottish gentlemen to help Scottish immigrants adjust to life in the New World. This impressive organization gets its name from Scotland's patron saint and is the oldest charitable membership organization in North America.

Throughout the subsequent two and a half centuries, the Scots have used their talent and hard work to the service of this country. A monument was constructed on October 8, 2011 in Philadelphia to commemorate Scottish immigration and depicts the importance of Scots to the success of the United States. I am proud that this monument serves as a symbol of the American Dream in my district.

Established in 1988 by a U.S. Senate Resolution, Tartan day serves to recognize the achievements and contributions made by Scottish Americans to the United States. In Philadelphia, a ceremony, facilitated by the St. Andrew's Society of Philadelphia, was held on April 7 to honor the occasion.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the vigintennial of Tartan day and the years of service Scottish immigrants have brought not only to Philadelphia but to this country.

HONORING SCOTT FLEMING ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Scott Fleming, a former House staffer and longtime public servant who is retiring in May after seventeen years working for Georgetown University. Over the years, I've had the opportunity to get to know Scott well, both through his work on Capitol Hill and in the Clinton Administration as well as later during his long tenure as a liaison between Georgetown University, my law school alma mater, and Congress.

Scott's association with Georgetown goes back more than four decades. He graduated from Georgetown's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service in 1972 with a bachelor's degree. Already, though, he was working for Sen. Stuart Symington, from his home state of Missouri, as a Staff Assistant. After obtaining his master's degree in public policy from the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas-Austin, Scott went to work for Rep. Dan Glickman from Kansas, serving from 1975 to 1988 in the roles of Legislative Assistant, Legislative Staff Director, and Chief of Staff. When Rep. NITA LOWEY was elected, she hired Scott in 1989 as her first Chief of Staff and to oversee the opening of her Congressional office.

Leaving the House in 1995 with a wealth of legislative experience and institutional knowledge, Scott joined the Clinton Administration's Department of Education as Deputy Assistant Secretary and Director of Congressional Affairs. Later, he served as Assistant Secretary for Legislation and Congressional Affairs. When President Clinton left office in 2001, Scott left government service but didn't venture too far. He returned to his alma mater to serve as Georgetown's Associate Vice President of Federal Relations. While doing so,

Scott has also served on the boards of the National Association of Independent College and Universities and of NAFA: Association of International Educators Public Policy Advisory Committee.

During his tenure, Scott worked tirelessly to secure federal funding for key educational initiatives benefitting students at Georgetown and at institutions of higher education across the country. He's won accolades for his work to shape the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill and related legislation to increase benefits available to veterans seeking to attend college and graduate school. In recent years, Scott has been at the forefront of efforts by Georgetown and other universities to prevent the deportation of DREAMers studying in this country, which they've called home from a young age, and wishing to be a part of building its future. Throughout his time at Georgetown, he's been a fervent promoter of public service careers, taking time to bring students to Capitol Hill and teaching classes at Georgetown's McCourt School of Public Policy.

Scott has been an advisor, friend, and—in my opinion—the embodiment of the Jesuit principles that make up the 'Spirit of Georgetown' throughout his career. I wish my fellow Hoya all the best in retirement and thank him for his service to the Congress, in the executive branch furthering educational opportunities in our country, and to Georgetown University and institutions of higher learning throughout America.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVID DOWNING

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of David M. Downing, a diligent worker, kind employer, devoted husband, father, brother, and friend. After a hard-fought battle with cancer, David passed away Sunday, April 8, 2018 at the age of 53.

David grew up in Orchard Park and graduated from Canisius High School. He continued to Princeton University where he earned his degree in History. While at Princeton, David played both golf and hockey for the University. After his time there, David returned to Buffalo to get his MBA from the University at Buffalo.

Eager to apply his skills, David started working outside of the family business at Procter & Gamble and Rich Products in sales and marketing. However, drawn towards the family profession, in 1994 he joined his brother Frank Downing, Jr. at Towne Automotive Group, the business started by their father, Frank Downing, Sr.

Together the two brothers worked side by side to grow their family business into one of the largest automobile dealers in the region. At one point, David even served as Vice President of the dealership, while Frank served as President. The brothers proved to be a good pair in business and worked together harmoniously. When Towne's longtime Chief Financial Officer Mike Smith retired, David assumed his role. In this position David managed the dealer group's relationships with banks and insurance companies, dealt with

Towne's real estate and franchise agreements, and served as Frank's business partner.

David's life was not all work as he cherished his time with his family as well: his wife Karen; four sons Joseph, Stephen, David Jr. and Ethan; brothers Frank, Stephen and Matthew; and two sisters, Molly Regan and Gretchen Cappiello. In his spare time he volunteered with non-profits and spent time with his wife and varied network of friends. All appreciated David's positivity and resilience in his struggle with cancer, his ability to keep moving forward despite hardship.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor David Downing's life and legacy. His impact on his community, colleagues, and family is admirable, and I offer my deepest condolences to his family, friends, and colleagues.

RECOGNIZING NEW KINGERY PRINTING COMPANY

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the New Kingery Printing Company as it celebrates its 50th anniversary.

New Kingery press, located in Effingham, Illinois, will mark this milestone by installing a new, state-of-the-art press. For many years to come, this dynamic, efficient, and cost-saving upgrade will give New Kingery the capacity to meet its customers' future needs. The press's new nonstop feeders are 50 percent faster than its predecessors', able to be fed either sheets or rolls, and can handle projects that require light-weight paper on up to heavier cardboard. With the new upgrades this family-owned and operated business, which specializes in catalogs, publications, marketing collateral and book production, will continue its tradition of providing great service and high quality work.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to acknowledge Michael Kingery, who is a second generation president of New Kingery Printing Company, and all of the employees whose hard work and dedication has made New Kingery Press the success that it is today, and the success it will remain in the future. I wish the company all the best.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF ATHANASIOS "TOM" P. VOUVOUNAS

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Athanasios "Tom" P. Vouvous, 101, who passed away peacefully on Friday, March 30, 2018 at the Humility House in Austintown, Ohio with his family by his side.

I will never forget Tom as long as I live. He was almost 90 years old when he came to Washington, DC., and we visited the World War II Memorial. Tom arrived wearing the

same uniform he wore in France which still fit him like the day he first put it on. We rode together on the Metro and sat down across from another man around Tom's age who was dressed as a civilian. The man immediately recognized Tom's uniform and started to talk with him. As it turned out, both of these men had served in the same unit those many years ago. I remember it as a wonderful day when two heroes were reunited.

Tom was born on May 27, 1916 in Nenedes Samos, Greece, to Prodromos Vouvous and Angeliki Safoulis Vouvous. Tom came to the United States in 1933 to Youngstown, Ohio and moved to Warren, Ohio in 1945. He bravely served in the U.S. Army and fought in World War II at Normandy, France and in the Battle of the Bulge.

After serving in the Army, Tom returned home to serve the state of Ohio and his community in Warren. He was the co-owner of Liberty Restaurant on Main Street, with his wife, and he worked for the Ohio Department of Liquor Control as a manager of State Liquor Store on Main Street. Tom also worked as a Warren Transit bus driver. Tom was also an active member at St. Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church in Warren. He was involved as an altar server, American Hellenic Education Progressive Association (AHEPA), senior group, Yasou Club, past President of the Church 50 Club, and an active participant with the church festival. In his free time, Tom enjoyed going to the track, gardening, and planting flowers.

He is survived by his nine children, Perry Vouvous of Cortland, Pete (Jacqueline) Vouvous of Howland, Angela (Christopher) Kalafatis of Dallas, Parisa (Frank) Gombarcik of Howland, Demetra Vouvous and Christos Vouvous, both of Houston, Nick Vouvous of Bayshore, Long Island, N.Y., Maria (Curtis) Elder of Warren and Joanna (Edward) Colucci of Girard; 13 grandchildren; 23 great-grandchildren and five great-great-grandchildren. He was preceded in death by his parents; wife, Helen T. Vouvous; a brother, Andreas Vouvous; and a sister-in-law, Helen A. Vouvous.

Tom was a valued member of the community, and I know he is dearly missed. I am thankful for the memories I have with him, and I extend my sincerest condolences to his family and friends.

HONORING THE GAY AND LESBIAN ACTIVISTS ALLIANCE OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 47th anniversary of the Gay and Lesbian Activists Alliance of Washington, D.C. (GLAA) on April 26, 2018. GLAA is a valued and respected local organization long in the vanguard of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) community's struggle for equal rights.

GLAA, since its founding in April 1971, has been in the business of advocating for the District of Columbia's full and equal rights and for residents' civil rights. The Alliance defended the District's landmark D.C. Human Rights Act

of 1977 and also demanded the Act's broad enforcement. In addition, GLAA forcefully advocates for LGBTQ youth, seniors and consumers as well as for the rights of transgender people. GLAA especially focuses on transgender rights regarding equal treatment by the police and access to culturally competent healthcare.

GLAA also builds and nurtures coalitions with other constituencies. Specifically, it educates and rates candidates for D.C. offices. GLAA also works with its coalition partners and D.C. elected officials to advance its goals and to defend the District's autonomy. More recently, GLAA worked with its coalition partners to achieve the enactment of the District of Columbia Religious Freedom and Civil Marriage Equality Amendment Act, which permits same-sex couples to marry in the District of Columbia.

GLAA will present its 2018 Distinguished Service Awards to recipients at a reception on April 26, 2018. The awardees include:

Check It Enterprises, formerly the Check It Gang, started as a street gang 10 years ago. The gang formed when a group of LGBTQ youth banded together as a gang in response to bullying and attacks on their LGBTQ identities. The members' oppression, traumatization and victimization produced anti-social behaviors. Check It members received no positive reinforcement or encouragement until they met a mentor, Ron Moten, five years ago. Ron never gave up on them and showed them a better way. Under his tutelage, Check It founded a clothing line and opened a business in Historic Anacostia. They raised \$50,000 in remodeling costs for a building, where they make and sell clothing. The space also provides a safe haven for LGBTQ youth and young adults, as well as an area for other activities and programs. In 2016, filmmakers Diana Flor and Toby Oppenheim chronicled them in the award-winning documentary, Check It.

D.C. Councilmember Mary M. Cheh, who has represented Ward 3 since 2007, chairs the Committee on Transportation and the Environment. Councilmember Cheh authored the Conversion Therapy for Minors Prohibition Amendment Act of 2013 and the Death with Dignity Act of 2015. Additionally, her legislative advocacy includes measures to protect the environment, combat homelessness, punish bias crimes against homeless individuals and eliminate the statute of limitations for the prosecution of sexual assault. She fights alongside community advocates for LGBTQ issues, particularly those advocating for homeless LGBTQ youth. Councilmember Cheh also supports legislation to require individuals subject to temporary protective orders to surrender their guns and to prevent domestic violence through the creation of a Domestic Violence High-Risk Team, which is based upon a successful model in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Don Blanchon, the executive director of Whitman-Walker Health is the third awardee. He guides Whitman-Walker in its commitment to provide an affirming and safe health care environment to gender and sexual minorities and other marginalized communities in the District. During his 11 years of leadership, Whitman-Walker has emphasized treating the whole person, integrating the role that advocacy and legal intervention play into that care.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the recipients of

GLAA's 2018 Distinguished Service Award and in celebrating GLAA's 47 years of contributions to the LGBTQ community here in the District of Columbia.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN T. GLASSON

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of John T. Glasson. Known by many as "Johnny Angel" he had an infectious smile. For 47 years John was a volunteer firefighter with Levittown Fire Company No. 2 where he served for some time as Deputy Chief. An active member of his community, John was a third-degree brother with the Knights of Columbus and helped to organize the South East Pennsylvania National Fallen Firefighter Foundation golf outings as well as raising funds for Local 22 IAFF Widow's Fund. In total, John helped raise over \$180,000 for charitable organizations. John will be forever remembered by his large family including many brothers and sisters but also by the handful of individuals whose lives he saved as a volunteer firefighter. While John did not like to recount those stories, his impact on the Lower Bucks community will be felt for generations to come. Mr. Speaker, John exemplified how active participants can be a force for good in their communities. My district is better because of men like John Glasson.

IN HONOR OF THE VOLUNTEERS
OF THE HOSPICE AND PALLIATIVE
CARE CENTER OF
ALAMANCE-CASWELL

HON. MARK WALKER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passionate and committed volunteers of the Hospice and Palliative Care Center of Alamance-Caswell, in Burlington, North Carolina.

It is fitting to recognize these individuals during April, National Volunteer Month. Hospice of Alamance-Caswell is the only non-profit hospice care center in the Burlington area. This organization depends on the efforts of volunteers and could not survive without their hard work.

For decades, volunteers have donated their time to patients and family members, selflessly giving to those in need. These volunteers have demonstrated a commitment to the mission: to offer the right care, at the right time, in the right way.

In addition to medical treatment, volunteers provide assistance and comfort for the families of patients. Through each step, administrative support, fundraising, patient care and companionship, these individuals are there in times when they are needed most.

It is a privilege to honor the volunteers of the Hospice and Palliative Care Center of Alamance-Caswell. Through their hard work, compassion, and desire to serve, they demonstrate the charitable spirit we are so fortunate to have in North Carolina.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the following votes because I chose to remain in my congressional district in Miami for an important district event.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

Yes on Roll Call Vote No. 130;

Yes on Roll Call Vote No. 131; and

No on Roll Call Vote No. 132.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, April 12, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 17

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Admiral Philip S. Davidson, USN, for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Commander, United States Pacific Command, and General Terrence J. O'Shaughnessy, USAF, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United States Northern Command, and Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command, both of the Department of Defense.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the National Guard and Reserve.

SD-192

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Thelma Drake, of Virginia, to be Federal Transit Administrator, Department of Transportation, Jeffrey Nadaner, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and Seth Daniel Appleton, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-538

- Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Karl L. Schultz, to be Admiral and to be Commandant of the Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security.
SR-253
- Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold an oversight hearing to examine deferred maintenance and operational needs of the National Park Service.
SD-366
- Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine United States policy in Yemen.
SD-419
- 2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
To hold hearings to examine Navy ship-building programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR-232A
- APRIL 18
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine abusive robocalls and how to stop them.
SR-253
- Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine the appropriate role of states and the Federal government in protecting groundwater.
SD-406
- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of David Williams, of Illinois, Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, and Calvin R. Tucker, of Pennsylvania, each to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service.
SD-342
- Committee on the Judiciary
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Patent and Trademark Office.
SD-226
- 2 p.m.
Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans
To hold hearings to examine the history and structure of the multiemployer pension system.
SD-215
- 2:30 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation within the Department of the Interior.
SD-430
- Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD-192
- Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities
To hold hearings to examine accelerating new technologies to meet emerging threats.
SR-232A
- Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security
To hold hearings to examine Olympic abuse, focusing on the role of national governing bodies in protecting our athletes.
SR-253
- Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the 30th anniversary of tribal self-governance, focusing on successes in self-governance and an outlook for the next 30 years.
SD-628
- Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration
To hold hearings to examine strengthening and reforming America's immigration court system.
SD-226
- 3:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
To hold hearings to examine Air Force modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR-222
- APRIL 19
- 9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SD-G50
- APRIL 24
- 9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SD-G50
- APRIL 25
- 2:30 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine H.R. 597, to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and H.R. 1491, to reaffirm the action of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for the benefit of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians.
SD-628
- APRIL 26
- 9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense budget posture in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SH-216

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2047–S2082

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2644–2652, S.J. Res. 58, and S. Res. 457–459. **Page S2075**

Measures Reported:

S. 1160, to include Livingston County, the city of Jonesboro in Union County, and the city of Freeport in Stephenson County, Illinois, to the Lincoln National Heritage Area. (S. Rept. No. 115–224)

S. 1181, to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–225)

S. 1260, to authorize the exchange of certain Federal land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore for certain non-Federal land in Jackson County, Mississippi. (S. Rept. No. 115–226)

S. 1602, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Finger Lakes National Heritage Area. (S. Rept. No. 115–227)

H.R. 2615, to authorize the exchange of certain land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore, Jackson County, Mississippi, between the National Park Service and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–228) **Pages S2074–75**

Measures Passed:

Oswaldo Paya Sardinas: Senate agreed to S. Res. 224, recognizing the 6th anniversary of the death of Oswaldo Paya Sardinas, and commemorating his legacy and commitment to democratic values and principles, after agreeing to the committee amendments. **Pages S2078–79**

Authorizing Representation by Senate Legal Counsel: Senate agreed to S. Res. 457, to authorize testimony and representation in *Kuwait and Gulf Link Transport Co., et al. v. John Doe, et al.* (Ct. of Common Pleas, Cumberland County, Pa.) **Page S2079**

Sesquicentennial of Connecticut's Navy Installation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 458, designating April 11, 2018, as the "Sesquicentennial of Connecticut's Navy Installation". **Page S2079**

Pizzella Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor. **Pages S2058–67**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 68), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S2058–59**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, all post-cloture time on the nomination expire at 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, April 12, 2018, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; and that there be two minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to each vote. **Page S2067**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 9:15 a.m., on Thursday, April 12, 2018. **Page S2081**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 50 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. EX. 67), John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2022. **Pages S2049–58, S2082**

Messages from the House: **Pages S2070–71**

Measures Referred: **Page S2071**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2071–74**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2075–76**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2076–77**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2069–70**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2077**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—68) **Pages S2058–59**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:54 p.m., until 9:15 a.m. on Thursday, April 12, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2081.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies: Senators Hoeven (Chair), McConnell, Collins, Blunt, Moran, Rubio, Hyde-Smith, Merkley, Feinstein, Tester, Udall, Leahy, and Baldwin.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies: Senators Moran (Chair), Alexander, Murkowski, Collins, Graham, Boozman, Capito, Lankford, Kennedy, Shaheen, Leahy, Feinstein, Reed, Coons, Schatz, Manchin, and Van Hollen.

Subcommittee on Department of Defense: Senators Shelby (Chair), McConnell, Alexander, Collins, Murkowski, Graham, Blunt, Daines, Moran, Hoeven, Durbin, Leahy, Feinstein, Murray, Reed, Tester, Udall, Schatz, and Baldwin.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development: Senators Alexander (Chair), McConnell, Shelby, Collins, Murkowski, Graham, Hoeven, Kennedy, Lankford, Feinstein, Murray, Tester, Durbin, Udall, Shaheen, Merkley, and Coons.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government: Senators Lankford (Chair), Moran, Boozman, Daines, Kennedy, Coons, Durbin, Manchin, and Van Hollen.

Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security: Senators Capito (Chair), Shelby, Murkowski, Boozman, Hoeven, Lankford, Kennedy, Tester, Shaheen, Leahy, Murray, Baldwin, and Manchin.

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: Senators Murkowski (Chair), Alexander, Blunt, McConnell, Daines, Capito, Rubio, Hyde-Smith, Udall, Feinstein, Leahy, Reed, Tester, Merkley, and Van Hollen.

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies: Senators Blunt (Chair), Shelby, Alexander, Graham, Moran, Capito, Lankford, Kennedy, Rubio, Hyde-Smith, Murray, Durbin, Reed, Shaheen, Merkley, Schatz, Baldwin, Murphy, and Manchin.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch: Senators Daines (Chair), Hyde-Smith, Shelby, Murphy, and Van Hollen.

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies: Senators Boozman (Chair), McConnell, Murkowski, Hoeven, Collins, Capito, Moran, Rubio, Schatz, Tester, Murray, Reed, Udall, Baldwin, and Murphy.

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs: Senators Graham (Chair), McConnell, Blunt, Boozman, Lankford, Daines, Rubio, Hyde-Smith, Leahy, Durbin, Shaheen, Coons, Merkley, Murphy, and Van Hollen.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies: Senators Collins (Chair), Shelby, Alexander, Blunt, Boozman, Capito, Daines, Graham, Hoeven, Reed, Murray, Durbin, Feinstein, Coons, Schatz, Murphy, and Manchin.

Senators Shelby and Leahy are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

APPROPRIATIONS: MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Missile Defense Agency, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Samuel A. Greaves, USAF, Director, Missile Defense Agency, Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of Agriculture, after receiving testimony from Sonny Perdue, Secretary, Robert Johansson, Chief Economist, and Diem-Linh Jones, Acting Budget Officer, all of the Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of Energy, including the National Nuclear Security Administration, after receiving testimony from Rick Perry, Secretary, Lisa E. Gordon-Hagerty, Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, and Paul M. Dabbar, Under Secretary for Science, all of the Department of Energy.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and

Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of Transportation, after receiving testimony from Elaine L. Chao, Secretary of Transportation.

SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities concluded open and closed hearings to examine Special Operations Command's efforts to transform the force for future security challenges, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Scott A. Howell, USAF, Vice Commander, Special Operations Command, Lieutenant General Kenneth E. Tovo, USA, Commanding General, Army Special Operations Command, Lieutenant General Marshall B. Webb, USAF, Commander, Air Force Special Operations Command, Rear Admiral Timothy G. Szymanski, USN, Commander, Naval Special Warfare Command, and Major General Carl E. Mundy III, USMC, Commander, Marine Corps Forces Special Operations Command, all of the Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support concluded a hearing to examine the health of the Department of Defense industrial base and its role in providing readiness to the warfighter, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Edward M. Daly, USA, Deputy Commanding General, Army Materiel Command, Vice Admiral Paul A. Grosklags, USN, Commander, Naval Air Systems Command, Vice Admiral Thomas J. Moore, USN, Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command, Lieutenant General Lee K. Levy II, USAF, Commander, Air Force Sustainment Center, Air Force Materiel Command, and Major General Craig C. Crenshaw, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Logistics Command, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine United States nuclear weapons policy, programs, and strategy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Guy B. Roberts, Assistant Secretary for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs, Robert M. Soofer, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy, General Robin Rand, USAF, Commander, Air Force Global Strike Command, and Vice Admiral Terry J. Benedict, USN, Director,

Strategic Systems Programs, all of the Department of Defense.

CBO BUDGET AND ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Congressional Budget Office's budget and economic outlook, focusing on fiscal years 2018–2028, after receiving testimony from Keith Hall, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Patrick Fuchs, of Wisconsin, and Michelle A. Schultz, of Pennsylvania, both to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, and Rebecca Kelly Slaughter, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, who was introduced by Senator Schumer, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

UTILIZING SIGNIFICANT EMISSIONS WITH INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES ACT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 2602, to support carbon dioxide utilization and direct air capture research, to facilitate the permitting and development of carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration projects and carbon dioxide pipelines, after receiving testimony from Senator Heitkamp; Mark Northam, University of Wyoming School of Energy Resources, Laramie; S. Julio Friedmann, CarbonWrangler LLC, Livermore, California; Noah Deich, Center for Carbon Removal, Oakland, California; and Feng Jiao, University of Delaware Center for Catalytic Science and Technology, Newark.

MARKET ACCESS CHALLENGES IN CHINA

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness concluded a hearing to examine market access challenges in China, after receiving testimony from Dean Garfield, Information Technology Industry Council, Christine Bliss, Coalition of Services Industries, Linda Menghetti Dempsey, National Association of Manufacturers, and Thea Mei Lee, Economic Policy Institute, all of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing 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, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

FEMA PREPAREDNESS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Federal Emergency Management Agency, focusing on prioritizing a culture of preparedness, after receiving testimony from William B. Long, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

OPIOID CRISIS RESPONSE ACT

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine an original bill entitled, “The Opioid Crisis Response Act of 2018”, after receiving testimony from Jennifer Donahue, Delaware Office of the Child Advocate, Georgetown; and Robert Morrison, National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, and Jessica Hulsey Nickel, Addiction Policy Forum, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

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, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

S. 2515, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes.

INDIAN PROGRAMS BUDGET

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2019 for Indian Programs, after receiving testimony from John Tahsuda, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs; Rear Admiral Michael D. Weahkee, Acting Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services; Aaron Payment, National Congress of American Indians, Washington, D.C.; and Robert McGhee, United South and Eastern Tribes Sovereignty Protection Fund, Nashville, Tennessee.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Mark Jeremy Bennett, of Hawaii, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Schatz, Nancy E. Brasel, and Eric C. Tostrud, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, who were introduced by Senator Smith, and Robert R. Summerhays, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, and Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, who were introduced by Senator Cassidy, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

DEFEATING FENTANYL

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism concluded a hearing to examine defeating fentanyl, focusing on addressing the deadliest drugs fueling the opioid crisis, including S. 2635, to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to modify the offenses relating to fentanyl, S. 2481, to increase the penalties for fentanyl trafficking, S. 2456, to reauthorize and expand the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016, and S. 207, to amend the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues, after receiving testimony from Christina E. Nolan, United States Attorney for the District of Vermont, Department of Justice; Kemp Chester, National Heroin Coordination Group, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Kenneth C. Miller, Greenville Police Department, Greenville, South Carolina; Josiah D. Rich, The Miriam Hospital, Providence, Rhode Island; and Brian J. Browne, University of Maryland School of Medicine Department of Emergency Medicine, Baltimore.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Paul R. Lawrence, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Benefits, and Joseph L. Falvey, Jr., of Michigan, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 14 public bills, H.R. 5466–5479; and 8 resolutions, H. Res. 814–821 were introduced. **Pages H3146–47**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3148–49**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 401, to designate the mountain at the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming, as Devils Tower, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–630);

H.R. 520, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to the economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–631); and

H.R. 4895, to establish the Medgar Evers National Monument in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–632). **Page H3146**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bacon to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3099**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:31 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H3103**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Chaplain Scott Foust, U.S. Air Force, Arlington Cemetery, Arlington, VA. **Page H3103**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H3103, H3112**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 814, electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. **Pages H3104–05**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:53 p.m. and reconvened at 1:40 p.m. **Page H3110**

Volcker Rule Regulatory Harmonization Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 811, providing for consideration of the bill (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, by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 134, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 186 noes, Roll No. 133. **Pages H3105–10, H3110–12**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 816, electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. **Page H3112**

Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act: The House passed H.R. 4061, to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, by a yea-and-nay vote of 297 yeas to 121 nays, Roll No. 135. **Pages H3119–28**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–64, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 115–600, shall be considered as adopted. **Page H3119**

H. Res. 780, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4061) and (H.R. 4293) was agreed to March 15th.

Stress Test Improvement Act: The House passed H.R. 4293, to reform the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review process, the Dodd-Frank Act Stress Test process, by a yea-and-nay vote of 245 yeas to 174 nays, Roll No. 137. **Pages H3112–19, H3128–29**

Rejected the Maxine Waters (CA) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 188 yeas to 231 nays, Roll No. 136. **Pages H3118–19, H3128–29**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–63, modified by the amendment printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–600, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. **Page H3112**

H. Res. 780, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4061) and (H.R. 4293) was agreed to March 15th.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H3104.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3110–11, H3111–12, H3128, H3128–29, and H3129. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

Committee Meetings

RAIL SAFETY AND INFRASTRUCTURE—STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Rail Safety and Infrastructure—Stakeholder Perspectives”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Institutes of Health. Testimony was heard from Francis Collins, Director, National Institutes of Health.

APPROPRIATIONS—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a budget hearing on the Internal Revenue Service. Testimony was heard from David J. Kautter, Acting Commissioner, Department of Treasury.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of the Interior. Testimony was heard from the following Department of the Interior officials: Ryan Zinke, Secretary; Denise Flanagan, Director, Office of Budget; and Olivia Barton Ferriter, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Budget, Finance, Performance and Acquisition.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. STRATEGIC COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the U.S. Strategic Command. Testimony was heard from General John E. Hyten, Commander, U.S. Strategic Command. This hearing was closed.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Testimony was heard from RDML Tim Gallaudet, U.S. Navy (Ret.), Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Acting Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Department of Commerce.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a budget hearing on the Department of the Treasury International Programs. Testimony was heard from Steven Mnuchin, Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a budget hearing on the Department of Homeland Security. Testimony was heard from Kirstjen Nielsen, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. CAPITOL POLICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the U.S. Capitol Police. Testimony was heard from the following U.S. Capitol Police officials: Matthew R. Verderosa, Chief of Police; Steven A. Sund, Assistant Chief of Police; and Richard L. Braddock, Chief Administrative Officer.

CYBER OPERATIONS TODAY: PREPARING FOR 21ST CENTURY CHALLENGES IN AN INFORMATION-ENABLED SOCIETY

Committee On Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Cyber Operations Today: Preparing for 21st Century Challenges in an Information-Enabled Society”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MEMBER DAY

Committee On Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Chabot, and Representatives Velázquez, Kihuen, Donovan, Johnson of Louisiana, Rutherford, and Schneider.

A REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BUDGET, STRATEGY, POLICY, AND PROGRAMS FOR CYBER OPERATIONS AND U.S. CYBER COMMAND FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled “A Review and Assessment of the Department of Defense Budget, Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Cyber Operations and U.S. Cyber Command for Fiscal Year 2019”. Testimony was heard from Kenneth P. Rapuano, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security, Department

of Defense; and Admiral Michael Rogers, Commander, U.S. Cyber Command, Director, National Security Agency.

FACEBOOK: TRANSPARENCY AND USE OF CONSUMER DATA

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Facebook: Transparency and Use of Consumer Data”. Testimony was heard from a public witness.

UPDATE ON THE RESTORATION OF PUERTO RICO’S ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Update on the Restoration of Puerto Rico’s Electric Infrastructure”. Testimony was heard from Charles R. Alexander, Director, Contingency Operations and Homeland Security Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Jeffrey Byard, Associate Administrator, Office of Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Bruce J. Walker, Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

COMBATING THE OPIOID CRISIS: IMPROVING THE ABILITY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID TO PROVIDE CARE FOR PATIENTS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health began a hearing entitled “Combating the Opioid Crisis: Improving the Ability of Medicare and Medicaid to Provide Care for Patients”.

THE 2018 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The 2018 Semi-Annual Report of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”. Testimony was heard from Mick Mulvaney, Acting Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

FINANCING OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT: THE ADMINISTRATION’S PROPOSAL

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Financing Overseas Development: The Administration’s Proposal”. Testimony was heard from Ray W. Washburne, President and Chief Executive Officer, Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

NORTH KOREA’S DIPLOMATIC GAMBIT: WILL HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF?

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled “North Ko-

rea’s Diplomatic Gambit: Will History Repeat Itself?”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NO ABDUCTED CHILD LEFT BEHIND: AN UPDATE ON THE GOLDMAN ACT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “No Abducted Child Left Behind: An Update on the Goldman Act”. Testimony was heard from Suzanne Lawrence, Special Advisor for Children’s Issues, Office of Children’s Issues, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5283, to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 7, title 20, and title 43, United States Code; H.R. 5293, to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions that were formerly classified to title 50, Appendix, United States Code; H.R. 5335, to make technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions reclassified to title 34, United States Code; H.R. 5344, 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; and H.R. 5447, the “Music Modernization Act”. H.R. 5283, H.R. 5293, H.R. 5335, H.R. 5344, and H.R. 5447 were ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3144, to provide for operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System pursuant to a certain operation plan for a specified period of time, and for other purposes; H.R. 3392, the “Lake Bistineau Land Title Stability Act”; H.R. 3997, the “Free Veterans from Fees Act”; H.R. 4257, the “Advancing Conservation and Education Act”; and 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. H.R. 3144 and H.R. 5005 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 3392, H.R. 3997, and H.R. 4257 were ordered reported, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing on H.R. 1037, to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for

other purposes; H.R. 1791, the “Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Act”; H.R. 2991, the “Susquehanna National Heritage Area Act”; and H.R. 3045, the “Eastern Legacy Extension Act”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Reichert, Smucker, Lynch, and Messer; former Senator Slade Gorton; Joy Beasley, Acting Associate Director, Cultural Resources, Partnerships, and Science, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Leo S. Lutz, Mayor, Borough of Columbia, Columbia, Pennsylvania; and public witnesses.

LOCAL RESPONSES AND RESOURCES TO CURTAIL THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Healthcare, Benefits and Administrative Rules held a hearing entitled “Local Responses and Resources to Curtail the Opioid Epidemic”. Testimony was heard from Amy Haskins, Project Director, Jackson County Anti-Drug Coalition, West Virginia; Lisa Roberts, Coordinator, Scioto County Drug Action Team Alliance, Ohio; Derek Siegle, Executive Director, Ohio High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Program; and Karen Ayala, Lead Staff, DuPage Heroin/Opioid Prevention and Education Task-Force, Illinois.

SCHOLARS OR SPIES: FOREIGN PLOTS TARGETING AMERICA’S RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Oversight; and Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a joint hearing entitled “Scholars or Spies: Foreign Plots Targeting America’s Research and Development”. Testimony was heard from Michael Wessel, Commissioner, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission; and public witnesses.

THE STATE OF TRADE FOR AMERICA’S SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The State of Trade for America’s Small Businesses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a markup on H.R. 1206, to amend title 38, United States Code, to include the cost of applying to an institution of higher learning as part of the benefits provided under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program; 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, to amend title 38, United States Code, to pro-

vide for housing stipends and supply fee payments under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for individuals affected by extended school closures due to natural disasters; H.R. 4451, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs and to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under such programs; H.R. 4830, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the disapproval of any course of education for purposes of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs unless the educational institution providing the course permits individuals to attend or participate in courses pending payment by Department, and for other purposes; H.R. 4835, to extend the pilot program on off-base transition training for veterans and spouses; and H.R. 5044, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the treatment of certain surviving spouses under the contracting goals and preferences of the Department of Veterans Affairs. H.R. 4830 and H.R. 4451 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 1206, H.R. 3023, H.R. 3940, H.R. 4835, and H.R. 5044 were ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5446, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restrict the immediate sale of seized property by the Secretary of the Treasury to perishable goods; H.R. 5444, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; H.R. 5445, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve cybersecurity and taxpayer identity protection, and modernize the information technology of the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; H.R. 2901, the “Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Permanence Act of 2017”; H.R. 5440, to require notice from the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of any closure of a Taxpayer Assistance Center; H.R. 5438, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury to provide to taxpayers information regarding low-income taxpayer clinics; legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restrict the immediate sale of seized property by Secretary of the Treasury to perishable goods; H.R. 5437, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a program for the issuance of identity protection personal identification numbers; H.R. 5439, to provide for a single point of contact at the Internal Revenue Service for the taxpayers who are victims of tax-related identity theft; legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require

electronic filing of the annual returns of exempt organizations and provide for making such returns available for public inspection; H.R. 4403, the “Moving Americans Privacy Protection Act”; H.R. 1512, the “Social Security Child Protection Act of 2017”; H.R. 5192, the “Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act”. H.R. 5444, H.R. 5445, H.R. 2901, H.R. 5440, H.R. 5438, H.R. 5446, H.R. 5437, H.R. 5439, H.R. 5443, H.R. 4403, H.R. 1512, and H.R. 5192 were ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

UNLEASHING AMERICA’S ECONOMIC POTENTIAL

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine unleashing America’s economic potential, after receiving testimony from Douglas Holtz-Eakin, American Action Forum, Chad Moutray, National Association of Manufacturers, and Mark J. Mazur, Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center, all of Washington, D.C.; and Richard Hampton, Circuit Interruption Technology Inc., Rogers, Minnesota.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of Labor, 10 a.m., SD-124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2019 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s semi-annual report to Congress, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the 2018 hurricane season, focusing on the status of preparation and response capabilities, 9:45 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the 2018 tax filing season and future Internal Revenue Service challenges, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Mike Pompeo, of Kansas, to be Secretary of State, 10:15 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Manage-

ment, to hold hearings to examine the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 994, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the protection of community centers with religious affiliation, and the nominations of John B. Nalbandian, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kari A. Dooley, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Dominic W. Lanza, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, Jill Aiko Otake, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii, Michael Y. Scudder, of Illinois, and Amy J. St. Eve, of Illinois, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Charles J. Williams, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa, and Joseph H. Hunt, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Timothy A. Garrison, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Missouri, Kenji M. Price, to be United States Attorney for the District of Hawaii, John Cary Birtick, to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Georgia, David L. Lyons, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Georgia, and Rodney D. Ostermiller, to be United States Marshal for the District of Montana, all of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Smithsonian Institution, 9:30 a.m., 2007 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, budget hearing entitled “Investments in our Health Workforce and Rural Communities”, 10 a.m., 2358-C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 10 a.m., H-309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Defense, budget hearing on the U.S. National Guard and Reserve, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Government Publishing Office, 10 a.m., HT-2 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on Energy, Installations, and Environment, 10 a.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, budget hearing on the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Architect of the Capitol, 2 p.m., HT-2 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Transportation, 2 p.m., 2358-A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Fiscal Year 2019 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for Combat Aviation Programs”, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing entitled “355 Ship Navy: Delivering the Right Capabilities”, 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Congressional Budget Office’s Budget and Economic Outlook”, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, continue hearing entitled “Combating the Opioid Crisis: Improving the Ability of Medicare and Medicaid to Provide Care for Patients”, 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled “The Fiscal Year 2019 Department of Energy Budget”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Oversight of the Federal Housing Finance Agency”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee, hearing on H.R. 4311, the “Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act of 2017”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, hearing entitled “Building for the Future: Examining Challenges Facing the Department of Homeland Security’s Consolidated Headquarters Project”, 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security, hearing entitled “Examining the President’s FY 2019 Budget Request for the Transportation Security Administration”, 2 p.m., HVC–210.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 4631, the “Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act”; and H.R. 5305, the “FDLP Modernization Act of 2018”, 11 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Full Committee, hearing entitled “Examining the Role of Shared Employees in the House”, 11 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing on legislation on the Permitting Litigation Efficiency Act of 2018; and H.R. 4423, the “North Texas Water Supply Security Act of 2017”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans, hearing entitled “Examining the Proposed Fiscal Year 2019 Spending, Priorities and Missions of the Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Four Power Marketing Administrations”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled “The Benefits of the Navajo Generation Station on Local Economies”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations; and Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Affairs, joint hearing entitled “Improper Payments in State-Administered Programs: Medicaid”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security, hearing entitled “A ‘Caravan’ of Illegal Immigrants: A Test of U.S. Borders”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight, and Regulations, hearing entitled “Community Support: Entrepreneurial Development and Beyond”, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 5294, the “Treating Barriers to Prosperity Act of 2018”; H.R. 3288, the “Northern Border Regional Commission Reauthorization Act of 2017”; H. Con. Res. 115, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; H. Con. Res. 113, authorizing the use of Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; legislation on the General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program; H.R. 4177, the “PRE-PARE Act of 2017”; H.R. 5319, to transfer Coast Guard property in the Town of Jupiter Island, Florida, for inclusion in Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge; H.R. 5326, the “Maritime Technical Corrections Act of 2018”; and H.R. 4673, the “Promoting Women in the Aviation Workforce Act”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Hearing on the Effects of Tariff Increases on the U.S. Economy and Jobs”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Human Resources, hearing entitled “Jobs and Opportunity: Local Perspectives on the Jobs Gap”, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Department of Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture, hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Hearing”, 9 a.m., HVC–304. This hearing will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:15 a.m., Thursday, April 12

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, April 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 9:30 a.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Patrick Pizzella, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of the following measure under suspension of the Rules: H.J. Res. 2—Proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Banks, Jim, Ind., E431
Blum, Rod, Iowa, E429
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E434
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E434
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E429
Buck, Ken, Colo., E430, E433
Carter, Earl L. "Buddy", Ga., E431
Faso, John J., N.Y., E433
Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E436

Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E430
Harris, Andy, Md., E433
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E435
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E431, E434
Hultgren, Randy, Ill., E434
Jenkins, Evan H., W.Va., E433
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E430
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E431
Lujan Grisham, Michelle, N.M., E434
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E431

Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E435
Rogers, Harold, Ky., E429
Rohrabacher, Dana, Calif., E431
Rooney, Francis, Fla., E429, E430
Rosen, Jacky, Nev., E433
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E435
Shimkus, John, Ill., E433, E435
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E429, E432, E433
Walker, Mark, N.C., E436
Wilson, Frederica S., Fla., E436



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are