United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2017 No. 149

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

God of all creation, thank You for giving us another day.

At the end of a very busy week, we ask Your blessing upon the Members of this people's House. As they prepare to return to their districts, may they be prepared to listen to the interests of their constituents.

We ask Your blessing as well upon all the American people. May they be inclined to be active participants in the governing of our Nation and responsibly engaged with our democratic processes.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

RECOGNIZING KINGWOOD, NEW JERSEY, RESCUE SQUAD

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank the members of the Kingwood, New Jersey, Rescue Squad for helping a community in need recover from Hurricane Harvey.

After Harvey, many in the Houston area were without cell phone service, stranded by the rising waters, and lacking necessary means of communications to call authorities for help. One family in Kingwood, Texas, without cell reception but with a wireless internet connection made the savvy decision to see if they could contact rescue services by email. They used an internet search to locate the necessary authorities to coordinate their rescue.

Their internet search yielded the name Kingwood Rescue Squad—not their Kingwood, but Kingwood in Hunterdon County, New Jersey. Fortunately, the members of the New Jersey Kingwood Rescue Squad acted quickly to contact their partners in Texas to ensure that rescue services would be able to find and rescue the Texas family. They are now safe due to the coordinated efforts between the Kingwood, New Jersey, Rescue Squad and their respective partners in Texas.

I wish to thank the members of the squad for their service and express my gratitude that there are such fine and capable first responders located in the district I serve.

CONTINUE FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, for more than 50 years, community health centers across the United States have delivered affordable, accessible, and quality primary healthcare to patients regardless of their ability to pay. They care for the whole person, bringing together medical and behavioral health with pharmacy services.

In my district, I have seen the important work that goes on at community health centers in Massachusetts, in Lowell, Lawrence, Gardner, and Fitchburg. In 2016, these facilities and their staff cared for more than 100,000 people.

Unfortunately, community health centers are facing a funding cliff if the Community Health Center program is not reauthorized by the end of this year. A lack of funding means too many of my constituents would immediately lose access to care, putting the health of our communities at risk.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together and make sure this vital program is funded.

HONORING ALBERTO ''BETO'' GONZALES DURING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to commemorate Hispanic Heritage Month by honoring a dedicated community leader from our district, Alberto ''Beto'' Gonzales, whose work with the youth of our Hispanic community serves as a shining example for current and future generations.

Mr. Gonzales grew up in the Hispanic neighborhoods of South Omaha but, unfortunately, fell into drugs and alcohol and was part of a street gang by the age of 11. At the age of 23, Alberto met Sister Joyce Englert, who helped him learn about Christ and get off drugs permanently. As a result, Beto committed his life to helping youth.

Beto runs youth drug and alcohol treatment groups, outreach with schools, and served as a Boys Town crisis hotline counselor. Today, he serves

as an Omaha Police Department gang prevention and intervention specialist and a youth counselor for the South Omaha Boys and Girls Club. Through these efforts, Alberto Gonzales has touched and changed the lives of hundreds, if not thousands, of youths in the Hispanic community.

Alberto gives credit to God; his mother, who always prayed for him; Sister Joyce; and the many educators and professionals who encouraged him along the way.

REPEALING DACA IS WRONG AND UN-AMERICAN

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the 800,000 DREAMers and in strong opposition to the administration's decision to end DACA.

The President's decision neither reflects the values nor protects the interests of our Nation. Rather, termination of the DACA program will needlessly disrupt lives, separate families, harm communities, and hurt employers.

These fine people came to this country as children with their families from around the world, from Mexico, South America, South Korea, and India. They grew up in our neighborhoods, attended our schools, and, with their friends, drafted extraordinary dreams and aspirations for their future. This is the only country they know. Their faces are the face of America. Their dreams are the American Dream.

President Trump's decision to repeal DACA is wrong and un-American.

Mr. Speaker, these young men and women want nothing more than to make a positive contribution to our Nation's future, and they trusted our government to do right by them. It is now up to Congress to do just that.

It is long past time for this body to pass the DREAM Act and empower these DREAMers to live their lives and achieve their aspirations in confidence.

CONGRATULATING SHAWNEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Shawnee Community College, located in Ullin, Illinois, for its 50th anniversary.

For half a century, Shawnee College has provided opportunities for quality higher education, community education, training, and services that are accessible, affordable, and promote lifelong learning. The college is cutting edge and provides training programs that incorporate the most recent technologies to meet the ever-changing needs of students and the local economy.

I visited the community college last month and met with the faculty and their directors, and their passion is clear.

Congratulations to Shawnee College President Dr. Peggy Bradford, faculty, staff, and students on 50 years of excellence. I know that more than 50 years from now they will still be working and providing for the students of southern Illinois.

WE STAND WITH THE DREAMers

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, since the President's decision last week to end the DACA program, DREAMers across the country have lived each day in fear. I have heard that fear from my constituents in Illinois, which hosts the fourth largest DACA population in the country.

One of my constituents came to this country when he was 3. Now 23 years old, he is a university student, works at the local senior center, and he helps out in his father's small business on the weekends.

In his letter to me, he said: ''It is during these trying times that each one of us demonstrates who we are and what we truly stand for.'' I couldn't agree more. That is why I urge Speaker RYAN and my colleagues on both sides to pass the Dream Act.

Passing the Dream Act will show our country's DREAMers that we stand with them and that we believe in their promise. It will also show who we are and what we truly stand for.

RECOGNIZING BUCKS COUNTY FARMER OF THE YEAR, BRIAN BAHNCK

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bucks County's Farmer of the Year, Brian Bahnck, of the Pennywell Dairy Farm in Ottsville, the winner of this year's Fred Groshens Memorial Conservation Farmer Award for his use of conservation-focused management on his 77-acre property. By using no-till crop rotation, Brian grew crops without disturbing the soil through tillage or plowing, a practice that can reduce soil erosion by 85 to 95 percent.

Brian, along with his two daughters, Anna and Ella, have dedicated long hours and hard work to make his conservation farm a success. I am proud of the efforts of Brian and his family for their commitment to protect the natural resources in Bucks County.

I also want to thank Gretchen Schatschneider and Rachel Onuska at the Bucks County Conservation District and our county commissioners for their longstanding support of our natural resources.

We have a proud tradition in Bucks County, and our farmers have contributed so much to our community, and they will always remain an indispensable part of Bucks County's future.

ENDING DACA IS CONTRARY TO AMERICAN VALUES

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, by ending DACA, President Trump made our immigration system less fair and just for our young people.

These DREAMers study in our schools and work on our Main Streets. They are Americans, and the United States is their home. It makes no sense to deport them simply because of the actions of their parents. This decision is so contrary to our American values that even business leaders and faith leaders called on the President not to do it.

My grandmother came to this country from Jamaica as a domestic worker and, for a period of time, was undocumented. She did this so that my father could become the first member of our family to go to college. He repaid his mother and this country by becoming a doctor and working in some of the poorest neighborhoods near where I grew up. My father pursued the American Dream and, in turn, contributed to the greatness that is America.

Kicking these DREAMers out won't create jobs or make our neighborhoods safer. That is why we must pass the Dream Act. It is the right thing to do for our economic competitiveness, military readiness, and public safety.

We have legitimate disagreements on how to fix our immigration system, but let's not hold our DREAMers hostage. It is time for Congress to pass the Dream Act now.

MEDIA BLACKOUT

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, here are recent examples of the liberal national media's ignoring inconvenient news:

The economy grew by 3 percent last quarter, the fastest pace in years, but you might not know this good news because of the media blackout of the story by broadcast networks.

The media blackout extended to a story by The New York Times on a current Senator's corruption trial, which failed to mention he was a Democrat in a 1,200-word story.

The media hyped the claim that climate change was responsible for Hurricanes Harvey and Irma, but the media blacked out the fact that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change said that hurricanes are not increasing in intensity or frequency.

This is what the liberal media do: they ignore the facts that contradict

the liberal view they want to promote with their readers and viewers.

LET'S TRY AND MAKE AMERICA FAIRER

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

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the passage of the Dream Act, and I request my Democratic and Republican colleagues to stand together to try and address this very important issue in our country.

The issue of undocumented immigrants has been plaguing this country for almost 30 years now, going back to the 1980s, when people flowed over in the thousands from El Salvador during the death squads and the civil wars during that time.

As the mayor of the city of Glen Cove back in the 1990s, we dealt with this issue in my city, on one side people saying, ''Get those people out of here,'' on the other side people saying, ''They are just trying to live the American Dream like your father did.'' My father emigrated from Italy. I am a first-generation American. ''They are just trying to live the American Dream like your family did, trying to work hard and live a better life here in this country.''

When dealing with these difficult questions, we have to rely on the fundamental principles of this country, namely, that all men and women are created equal—not all men and women with a green card or all men and women with a passport, but all men and women are created equal and are entitled to be treated with human respect and dignity.

When looking at the DREAMers, we are talking about people who came to this country under 17 years of age, who have lived a productive life, who have either graduated from high school or received a GED and have now either gone to college or are serving in the military or have been working for the past 3 years and have no criminal background.

Let's try and make this country fairer. Let's try and make ourselves the model for the rest of the world to follow and lift up these people who are productive members of our community.

□ 0915

CRIMINAL ALIEN GANG MEMBER REMOVAL ACT

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 513, I call up the bill (H.R. 3697) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). Pursuant to House Resolution 513, the amendment printed in House Report 115–307 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 3697

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 ''Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act''.

SEC. 2. GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY FOR ALIEN GANG MEMBERS.

(a) DEFINITION OF GANG MEMBER.—Section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(53) The term 'criminal gang' means an ongoing group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons that has as one of its primary purposes the commission of 1 or more of the following criminal offenses and the members of which engage, or have engaged within the past 5 years, in a continuing series of such offenses, or that has been designated as a criminal gang by the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, as meeting these criteria. The offenses described, whether in violation of Federal or State law or foreign law and regardless of whether the offenses occurred before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, are the following:

''(A) A 'felony drug offense' (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)).

''(B) An offense under section 274 (relating to bringing in and harboring certain aliens), section 277 (relating to aiding or assisting certain aliens to enter the United States), or section 278 (relating to importation of alien for immoral purpose).

''(C) A crime of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code).

''(D) A crime involving obstruction of justice, tampering with or retaliating against a witness, victim, or informant, or burglary.

''(E) Any conduct punishable under sections 1028 and 1029 of title 18, United States Code (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents or access devices), sections 1581 through 1594 of such title (relating to peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons), section 1951 of such title (relating to interference with commerce by threats or violence), section 1952 of such title (relating to interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises), section 1956 of such title (relating to the laundering of monetary instruments), section 1957 of such title (relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity), or sections 2312 through 2315 of such title (relating to interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicles or stolen property).

''(F) A conspiracy to commit an offense described in subparagraphs (A) through (E).''.

(b) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(2) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(J) ALIENS ASSOCIATED WITH CRIMINAL GANGS.—Any alien is inadmissible who a consular officer, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe—

''(i) to be or to have been a member of a criminal gang (as defined in section 101(a)(53)); or

''(ii) to have participated in the activities of a criminal gang (as defined in section 101(a)(53)), knowing or having reason to know that such activities will promote, further, aid, or support the illegal activity of the criminal gang.''.

(c) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) ALIENS ASSOCIATED WITH CRIMINAL GANGS.—Any alien is deportable who—

''(i) is or has been a member of a criminal gang (as defined in section 101(a)(53)); or

''(ii) has participated in the activities of a criminal gang (as so defined), knowing or having reason to know that such activities will promote, further, aid, or support the illegal activity of the criminal gang.''.

(d) DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended by inserting after section 219 the following:

''DESIGNATION OF CRIMINAL GANG

''SEC. 220. (a) DESIGNATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, may designate a group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons as a criminal gang if the Secretary finds that their conduct is described in section 101(a)(53).

''(2) PROCEDURE.—

''(A) NOTIFICATION.—Seven days before making a designation under this subsection, the Secretary shall, by classified communication, notify the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore, Majority Leader, and Minority Leader of the Senate, and the members of the relevant committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of the intent to designate a group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons under this subsection and the factual basis therefor.

''(B) PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.—The Secretary shall publish the designation in the Federal Register seven days after providing the notification under subparagraph (A).

''(3) RECORD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In making a designation under this subsection, the Secretary shall create an administrative record.

''(B) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The Secretary may consider classified information in making a designation under this subsection. Classified information shall not be subject to disclosure for such time as it remains classified, except that such information may be disclosed to a court ex parte and in camera for purposes of judicial review under subsection (c).

''(4) PERIOD OF DESIGNATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A designation under this subsection shall be effective for all purposes until revoked under paragraph (5) or (6) or set aside pursuant to subsection (c).

''(B) REVIEW OF DESIGNATION UPON PETITION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall review the designation of a criminal gang under the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) and (iv) if the designated group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons files a petition for revocation within the petition period described in clause (ii).

''(ii) PETITION PERIOD.—For purposes of clause (i)—

''(I) if the designated group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons has not previously filed a petition for revocation under this subparagraph, the petition period begins 2 years after the date on which the designation was made; or

''(II) if the designated group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons has previously filed a petition for revocation under this subparagraph, the petition period begins 2 years after the date of the determination made under clause (iv) on that petition.

''(iii) PROCEDURES.—Any group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons that submits a petition for revocation under this subparagraph of its designation as a criminal gang must provide evidence in that petition that it is not described in section 101(a)(53).

''(iv) DETERMINATION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after receiving a petition for revocation submitted under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall make a determination as to such revocation.

''(II) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The Secretary may consider classified information in making a determination in response to a petition for revocation. Classified information shall not be subject to disclosure for such time as it remains classified, except that such information may be disclosed to a court ex parte and in camera for purposes of judicial review under subsection (c).

''(III) PUBLICATION OF DETERMINATION.—A determination made by the Secretary under this clause shall be published in the Federal Register.

''(IV) PROCEDURES.—Any revocation by the Secretary shall be made in accordance with paragraph (6).

''(C) OTHER REVIEW OF DESIGNATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If in a 5-year period no review has taken place under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall review the designation of the criminal gang in order to determine whether such designation should be revoked pursuant to paragraph (6).

''(ii) PROCEDURES.—If a review does not take place pursuant to subparagraph (B) in response to a petition for revocation that is filed in accordance with that subparagraph, then the review shall be conducted pursuant to procedures established by the Secretary. The results of such review and the applicable procedures shall not be reviewable in any court.

''(iii) PUBLICATION OF RESULTS OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall publish any determination made pursuant to this subparagraph in the Federal Register.

''(5) REVOCATION BY ACT OF CONGRESS.—The Congress, by an Act of Congress, may block or revoke a designation made under paragraph (1).

''(6) REVOCATION BASED ON CHANGE IN CIRCUMSTANCES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may revoke a designation made under paragraph (1) at any time, and shall revoke a designation upon completion of a review conducted pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (4) if the Secretary finds that—

''(i) the group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons that has been designated as a criminal gang is no longer described in section 101(a)(53); or

''(ii) the national security or the law enforcement interests of the United States warrants a revocation.

''(B) PROCEDURE.—The procedural requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) shall apply to a revocation under this paragraph. Any revocation shall take effect on the date specified in the revocation or upon publication in the Federal Register if no effective date is specified.

''(7) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—The revocation of a designation under paragraph (5) or (6) shall not affect any action or proceeding based on conduct committed prior to the effective date of such revocation.

''(8) USE OF DESIGNATION IN TRIAL OR HEARING.—If a designation under this subsection has become effective under paragraph (2) an alien in a removal proceeding shall not be permitted to raise any question concerning the validity of the issuance of such designation as a defense or an objection.

''(b) AMENDMENTS TO A DESIGNATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may amend a designation under this subsection if the Secretary finds that the group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons has changed its name, adopted a new alias, dissolved and then reconstituted itself under a different name or names, or merged with another group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons.

''(2) PROCEDURE.—Amendments made to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (2), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

''(3) ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD.—The administrative record shall be corrected to include the amendments as well as any additional relevant information that supports those amendments.

''(4) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The Secretary may consider classified information in amending a designation in accordance with this subsection. Classified information shall not be subject to disclosure for such time as it remains classified, except that such information may be disclosed to a court ex parte and in camera for purposes of judicial review under subsection (c) of this section.

''(c) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DESIGNATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after publication in the Federal Register of a designation, an amended designation, or a determination in response to a petition for revocation, the designated group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons may seek judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

''(2) BASIS OF REVIEW.—Review under this subsection shall be based solely upon the administrative record, except that the Government may submit, for ex parte and in camera review, classified information used in making the designation, amended designation, or determination in response to a petition for revocation.

''(3) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—The Court shall hold unlawful and set aside a designation, amended designation, or determination in response to a petition for revocation the court finds to be—

''(A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law;

''(B) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity;

''(C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitation, or short of statutory right;

''(D) lacking substantial support in the administrative record taken as a whole or in classified information submitted to the court under paragraph (2); or

''(E) not in accord with the procedures required by law.

''(4) JUDICIAL REVIEW INVOKED.—The pendency of an action for judicial review of a designation, amended designation, or determination in response to a petition for revocation shall not affect the application of this section, unless the court issues a final order setting aside the designation, amended designation, or determination in response to a petition for revocation.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

''(1) the term 'classified information' has the meaning given that term in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.);

''(2) the term 'national security' means the national defense, foreign relations, or economic interests of the United States;

''(3) the term 'relevant committees' means the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and

''(4) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 219 the following:

''Sec. 220. Designation.''.

(e) MANDATORY DETENTION OF CRIMINAL GANG MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 236(c)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''or'' at the end; and

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

''(E) is inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(J) or deportable under section 217(a)(2)(G),''.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year (beginning 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act), the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the appropriate Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate on the number of aliens detained under the amendments made by paragraph (1).

(f) ASYLUM CLAIMS BASED ON GANG AFFILIATION.—

(1) INAPPLICABILITY OF RESTRICTION ON REMOVAL TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Section 241(b)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1251(b)(3)(B)) is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''who is described in section 212(a)(2)(J)(i) or section 237(a)(2)(G)(i) or who is'' after ''to an alien''.

(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR ASYLUM.—Section 208(b)(2)(A) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(2)(A)) (as amended by section 201 of this Act) is further amended—

(A) in clause (v), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (vii); and

(C) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

''(vi) the alien is described in section 212(a)(2)(J)(i) or section 237(a)(2)(G)(i); or''.

(g) TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.—Section 244 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Attorney General'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security'';

(2) in subparagraph (c)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) the alien is, or at any time has been, described in section 212(a)(2)(J) or section 237(a)(2)(G).''; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following: ''The Secretary of Homeland Security may detain an alien provided temporary protected status under this section whenever appropriate under any other provision of law.''.

(h) SPECIAL IMMIGRANT JUVENILE VISAS.—Section 101(a)(27)(J)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(J)(iii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking ''and'';

(2) in subclause (II), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) no alien who is, or at any time has been, described in section 212(a)(2)(J) or section 237(a)(2)(G) shall be eligible for any immigration benefit under this subparagraph;''.

(i) PAROLE.—An alien described in section 212(a)(2)(J) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (b), shall not be eligible for parole under section 212(d)(5)(A) of such Act unless—

(1) the alien is assisting or has assisted the United States Government in a law enforcement matter, including a criminal investigation; and

(2) the alien's presence in the United States is required by the Government with respect to such assistance.

(j) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to acts that occur before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3697.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 3697, the Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act. I introduced this bill with Chairman GOODLATTE and Representatives COMSTOCK and KING for a very simple reason: the United States is facing an ever-growing danger from transnational gangs, and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, better known as ICE, needs more tools to deal with this danger.

The Federal Government's most important responsibility is the safety and security of the American people. However, we are not fulfilling that responsibility when we allow gangs to illegally enter our country with the express purpose of victimizing innocent Americans.

In communities across our country, transnational gangs are using violence and the threat of violence to create a climate of fear that allows them to operate with near impunity. They regularly target local business owners and law enforcement officials. Innocent bystanders, those unlucky enough to be in the wrong place at the wrong time, are also paying a price.

According to ICE, these gangs ''have grown to become a serious threat in American communities across the Nation—not only in cities, but increasingly in suburban and even rural areas. Entire neighborhoods and sometimes whole communities are held hostage by and subjected to their violence.''

Furthermore, ICE has found that, ''membership of these violent transnational gangs is comprised largely of foreign-born nationals.''

The most infamous transnational gang, of course, is MS–13, which entered the U.S. in the 1980s. Today, it has over 10,000 gang members operating inside the United States alone. At every level, our enforcement officials are working to curb this growing threat with large-scale enforcement actions. These include Operation New Dawn, which netted almost 1,100 arrests over a 6-week period.

However, we all know that prosecution of criminal gang members is notoriously difficult. This is because victims and witnesses of gang crime are often reluctant to testify because of the quite reasonable fear of retaliation against them or their families, thus many gang members are never convicted of the crimes they have committed.

The question is often asked: Why should law-abiding Americans have to wait until an alien gang member has committed a deportable offense? Why not deport the gang member before he has a chance to victimize more innocent people? The answer is that current immigration law contains dangerous loopholes that alien gang members are exploiting.

Currently, an alien may not be deported, even if he is known to be a member of a criminal gang or participating in gang activities. ICE must wait for the gang member to be first convicted of a deportable offense.

H.R. 3697 changes that. For the first time, ICE will be permitted to place alien gang members into removal proceedings on the grounds of being criminal gang members. Our bill sets out clear specifications for what crimes are considered to be gang related, relying on longstanding Federal criminal law to determine what a gang or group consists of.

In addition, our bill permits the Secretary of Homeland Security, using procedures already used by the Secretary of State, to designate a gang as a criminal gang. This would be done in a transparent way through notification to Congress and publication in the Federal Register and with meaningful judicial review.

The conclusive decision as to whether to place an alien in removal proceedings would rest with the Department of Homeland Security. When an alien is charged, the charge must be proven by evidence on the record in immigration court.

I have heard some uneasiness that ICE will use these provisions to charge any alien they encounter with gang activity. Our bill does not allow that. As a former immigration attorney, I know the importance of due process and know how important it is for illegal immigrants and for Americans and everyone within the jurisdictions of the immigration court to receive due process. I can tell you that our bill is consistent with due process.

Under H.R. 3697, ICE has the burden of proof when charging an alien with a deportable offense. While the alien has the burden of proof when they are inadmissible, a denial of gang membership should be sufficient to shift the burden back to the government. The government must convince an immigration judge of its case. Of course, an alien ordered removed as a gang member has every right to appeal that order to the Board of Immigration Appeals and then to the Federal courts.

Ultimately, H.R. 3697 is about providing law enforcement with the necessary tools to combat gang activity in every community in our country. This is essential if we, as elected officials, are committed to our responsibility to keep the American people safe and secure. That is the purpose of H.R. 3697.

This is the third time this year the House is holding a floor vote on portions of the Davis-Oliver Act, which I introduced back in May, to make our country safer through stronger immigration enforcement.

I am proud that the House passed the first two bills that came from Davis-Oliver, Kate's Law and the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3697 as well.

We must take action now or watch crime rates rise in our Nation. There is no place in our country for criminal alien gang members, and any legislation which makes it easier to deport them deserves the support of every Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3697. Gang members and serious criminals should not be granted admission to the United States. That is not a controversial position. I think almost every Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, agrees with that. It is our highest priority to protect the safety of the American people. That is a duty I think we all take seriously, but this bill does something other than that.

The title of the bill is the Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act, and, as we have seen in the past, there are times when the name of a bill is not always reflected in the actual proposed language of the statute, and that is true in this case.

First, section 2(a) of the bill defines criminal gang as ''an ongoing group, club, organization, or association of five or more persons that has as one of its primary purposes the commission of one or more'' of a wide range of offenses. This may seem reasonable until you look at the offenses listed.

These offenses could sweep in many people that no reasonable person would think of as a gang member—for example, one of the offenses relates to the harboring of undocumented immigrants. This statute includes people who give shelter to, transport, or provide other kinds of aid to undocumented immigrants. That means that,

under this bill, a religious organization that aids undocumented immigrants could be a criminal gang.

This isn't just theoretical. During the 1980s, members of the faith community were repeatedly criminally prosecuted for providing transportation to undocumented immigrants. In one case, the FBI even infiltrated a Bible study group to learn about the group's plan to support undocumented immigrants. Under this bill, DHS would have expanded authority to go after all such groups as criminal gangs. In one fell swoop, it could turn nuns into gang members.

The bill also refers to felony drug offense, which would include the repeated possession of marijuana. In California, my State, along with several other States, voters decided to decriminalize marijuana—first, for medical uses, then later for broader uses. Under this bill, a group that regularly gets together to use marijuana that is legal under State law would still be committing a felony under Federal law and would be a criminal gang. That could include groups of people who are using marijuana for medicinal purposes to treat epilepsy or cancer who are taking marijuana consistent with State law.

Second, the bill authorizes DHS to deny admission or to deport any immigrant, including one who has no criminal history or gang affiliation whatsoever, so long as DHS merely believes the person is associated with such a group.

Sections 2(b) and 2(c) of the bill expressly authorize DHS officers and immigration judges to deport an immigrant on nothing more than a reason to believe that the individual has been a member of a gang or has participated in the activities of a gang as defined under these rather broad provisions. There is no need for conviction or even an arrest. All DHS needs is a belief that the individual has assisted any group of five or more people that DHS believes has committed one of these long list of offenses.

This belief could be as minimal as the color of a person's shirt, the neighborhood they live in, or the individuals in their family. This is not just unreasonable, it is probably unconstitutional. Chairman GOODLATTE had a self-actualizing amendment when the rule was adopted to change the evidentiary standard. I think it recognizes the problem with the bill.

The amendment really doesn't cure the problem with the breadth of the criminal gang definition, and it doesn't change the standard that applies to people seeking admission to the country, including those who are seeking to reunite with U.S. citizen spouses, parents, and children.

Just this week, I met with actual police officers who asked me to do what I could to defeat this unwise bill. They know, because they are out on the front lines, that gangs are a real problem, and they told me that bills like this, which could turn religious individuals, nuns, cancer victims into targets, is just going to get in their way as police officers.

If we want to keep America safe and admit immigrants who do not have a felony record, I would suggest that we consider the bipartisan Dream Act, H.R. 3440. This bill would provide a path to legal permanent residence for 800,000 young people who were raised in America, who consider this to be their home, who represent the very best of our country.

Instead of debating whether we should allow ICE officers to target religious workers, we should focus on what really makes this country great.

I would like to note that there has been much discussion about the drafting of this bill, and at the Rules Committee just last night, Republicans defended the bill by asserting that the broad provisions would not be abused by ICE officers. Even if they could target the nuns, they wouldn't do that. Even if they could target the cancer victims or the teenagers smoking marijuana after school as gang members, they wouldn't do that.

□ 0930

Now, I am not suggesting that the teenagers smoking marijuana after school is a good thing. But it is not MS–13. And that is what we are trying to make a distinction here between, a gang abatement bill and garden-variety activity that we may not like.

One really very good and very thoughtful Member on the other side of the aisle suggested that, if there is a problem with the bill, we will just come back and fix it. Here is why that is a problem: We know that when we draft something in a poor manner, it often goes on to be enforced and we never get around to fixing it.

I will give an example. We passed years ago, and I objected at the time—Henry Hyde was chairman of the committee—a provision that barred people from gaining status if they provided material support to terrorists.

Well, that sounds like a good idea, but what does it mean?

It turns out that material support—which was never qualified to include support given under duress or given in the ordinary course of a commercial activity—has now been used to bar people who are not terrorists, who didn't give material support.

I will give you an example. A group of women called the Tortilla Terrorists are women who were threatened with their lives and made tortillas because they were threatened with death by guerrilla actors. Now, they were denied asylum because of the tortillas, hence the name the Tortilla Terrorists.

I think most of us would agree that is not terrorism. Yet, we drafted the bill in such a way that the Department felt that they had to enforce it in that way, and we have never gone back to it.

So to think that somehow if we write a law poorly, it is going to be fixed in the administration, that is just wrong. We should step back from this. We should work together. This was just introduced last week.

Now, I know the SAFE Act had hearings years ago, but I think we would be better off if we sat down together, if we reasoned together, if we worked through the defects in this draft, and came up with a bill that really targeted MS–13 members, something that we could all support and that well-served our country.

I will just say that Sister Simone Campbell, one of the leading nuns in America, explained her opposition to this bill. She said:

> The bill's harboring provisions under INA 274 are so sweeping that religious workers who provide shelter, transportation, or support to undocumented immigrants could be found liable of criminal activity. This statute has been used against religious workers in the past, and the bill tries to make it a weapon for the future.

Let's listen to the nuns like we did in school, and step back, redraft this bill, and oppose this poorly crafted measure today.

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

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), the lead sponsor of this bill.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, early this summer, on a Friday night, just about 30 miles from this Capital, I went on a ride-along in my district with our Northern Virginia Regional Gang Task Force.

A young boy standing on the sidewalk along Sterling Boulevard in Sterling, Virginia, caught the eye of a veteran member of our task force. The young man on the street looked about 15 or 16 years old, but he was actually a 22-year-old member of the transnational violent street gang known as MS–13. He was covered in MS–13 gang tattoos—on his chest, his back, his feet.

It turned out, he had been in jail in El Salvador for murder as a teenager, and he had already been deported from the U.S. twice for engaging in violent crimes here.

Three other of the estimated thousands of MS–13 gang members that are just here in our Capital region were also picked up that night. There have been cases in northern Virginia where a suspected member of the MS–13 gang has been deported five times, yet returned again to continue their gang activity.

At a town festival in Herndon this year, the gang task force identified—because they go to these events and they see these people—an estimated 200 to 300 suspected gang members milling about among the families who were getting cotton candy and hot dogs for their kids. They are right there looking to recruit in their own communities.

Mr. Speaker, since November 2016, at least eight murders have been committed and tied to MS–13 and other

gangs in our area, representing a 166 percent increase over the last year in the northern Virginia region.

An MS–13-linked vicious murder occurred in November 2015. Of course, I should acknowledge that they are all vicious when you are talking about MS–13. This happened on an Alexandria playground in the evening just about 8 miles from this Capital, and it resulted in the death of 24-year-old Jose Luis Ferman Perez. He was nearly decapitated in the machete attack. His body was left on the playground and was found by a woman walking her dog the next morning. It could have been one of the kids playing on the playground finding that.

The Washington Post has highlighted how the 2014 border surge has contributed to the MS–13 problem, saying: ''The violent street gang is on the rise in the United States, fueled, in part, by the surge in unaccompanied minors.''

A recent Washington Post article documented the case of gang members who videotaped the murder of a 15-year-old girl, Damaris Reyes Rivas, who was savagely beaten by multiple people, and repeatedly stabbed by all of these gang members. The video of this was intended to be sent to MS–13 gang leadership in El Salvador to confirm that this greenlit murder had been carried out.

Tragically, MS–13 targets and preys upon their own community, on young people who may not have much of a family structure around them. Sadly, these children and young people were actually fleeing MS–13 in their own countries of El Salvador, Honduras, or Guatemala, only to come here and be targeted.

There was one case that, fortunately, the Northern Virginia Regional Gang Task Force was able to intercept, where a brother was trying to enlist his own brother to join the MS–13 gang. And when he refused to, he put a hit out on him. Fortunately, the gang task force was able to stop that.

We cannot allow this to stand. Mr. Speaker, the Northern Virginia Regional Gang Task Force is battling this problem in our region, but they still need more resources. In our appropriations process, we have directed more resources for our regional task forces. I have personally talked to Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, who is very familiar with this MS–13 problem, having been a U.S. attorney in the Maryland region.

Our regional task force is comprised of 13 local, State and Federal law enforcement agencies, and the task force has a three-pronged approach: education, intervention and prevention, and enforcement. We need to provide support on all three of these fronts.

I witnessed firsthand the exhausting work of the task force; the technology they utilize on the streets that was able to immediately identify just with fingerprints the background of this gang member that they were able to arrest; the detailed knowledge they have of our communities and our neighborhoods; the positive relationships they have with the people in these communities, the very people that are being victimized; and the challenges they face with this problem that has returned to our area.

That is why I sponsored H.R. 3697, the Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act, with my colleagues, so it will provide additional tools to law enforcement. It will ensure that when ICE positively identifies a known alien gang member, they may act immediately. This legislation identifies gang membership and participation in gang activity as grounds for inadmissibility and removability. We don't have to wait until these brutal killers wield their machetes or leave another body on a children's playground.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. This is a marked improvement over current law where ICE must wait for specific convictions before removal proceedings can commence. The bill preserves, as my colleague has already identified, all the due process and appellate rights afforded to any alien facing deportation.

An immigration judge must be convinced that the evidence in the record supports the finding. I encourage support of this legislation today, which will strengthen and enforce our laws against known violent gang members. I also will continue to work with my colleagues on other matters, such as the bill I introduced earlier this summer, to provide additional resources to our regional gang task forces for their education, intervention, and enforcement efforts.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), my colleague on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said about this body that if you invent a nice enough title for a bill, it doesn't matter what you write in the bill because all people know is what the title is. This bill is a good example of that.

Who is in favor of criminal alien gangs?

No one. But this bill has received no committee consideration in which the questions could have been asked and the answers given to make sure that the bill would do what its sponsors say it does.

But this legislation wouldn't provide decent protections against gang violence. It would shred due process protections and would allow deportation of innocent immigrants based on the flimsiest of evidence.

It would establish a Star Chamber-like process for designating criminal gangs that would provide virtually no opportunity for them to contest such a designation. Once a group is designated as a gang, an immigrant who is determined to be a member of that gang—determined under undefined procedures and standards—would be almost assured of being deported and would be subject to mandatory detention while awaiting removal.

The procedures under this bill would be laughable if they did not have such deadly consequences for so many innocent people. Suppose there are some people in my neighborhood that I think are up to no good. Maybe I have good evidence that they are committing crimes, or maybe I just don't like them. Either way, I submit a tip to Homeland Security that the group is engaged in activity that qualifies as a criminal gang under this bill.

Then, based on undefined and unknown procedures, the DHS can designate that group as a criminal gang. In doing so, it would amass some sort of administrative record, which is also completely undefined in the bill, but we know it can include secret evidence. No notice would be given to the group that is under review, and no opportunity would be given to present evidence contesting the designation; no exculpatory evidence.

After designation, there is a process for judicial review; but unless the group has the habit of scouring the Federal Register, it would have no idea that it has been labeled a gang and that it needs to go to court in 30 days. If, somehow, the group does learn of its designation, it has just 30 days to contest it, and only in a Federal Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C.

That review, however, would be based entirely on the administrative record amassed by the government. The group would have no opportunity to submit evidence to rebut the designation, which renders the entire review process meaningless. That is not due process under the Constitution. That is a sort of stacked process you would expect in a banana republic or in Russia.

It gets even worse. Under this bill, any alien is deportable if he or she is or has been a member of a designated gang or has participated in the gang's activities, knowing that would further its illegal activity.

But who determines that a person is a member of a gang? By what procedure? In what forum or what court? Using what standard?

The bill, given the Goodlatte amendment, does not say.

A person need not have been convicted or even charged with a crime to be deportable under this bill; and even when they are in removal proceedings, they would not be permitted to challenge the gang designation that landed them in those proceedings. Thus, we will have people deported on the basis of an unfair and secret process, with no notice and no meaningful opportunity to contest the basis for the deportation. That turns due process completely on its head.

Keeping out members of MS–13 and other deadly gangs is a worthy goal,

but this bill would not do that. It would have disastrous consequences for thousands of people each year who may or may not be members of a gang, who may or may not have any evidence against them, who will inevitably be caught up in its hash and overbroad provisions.

Mr. Speaker, just last week, President Trump upended the lives of 800,000 DREAMers who now face the possibility of being dragged away from the only country they know. Our highest priority should be providing these young, undocumented Americans the legal status they need to continue serving our Nation and being productive members of their communities.

I notice that the Speaker has said that, while he supports relief for the DREAMers, that the bill has to go through a committee.

Why didn't this bill have to go through a committee?

Instead, the Republican majority seeks to distract us from the plight of the DREAMers by returning to its mass deportation agenda based on the fear and dehumanization of immigrants.

This bill brings shame upon this House and this Nation's tradition of due process and fundamental fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this unconstitutional and unconscionable legislation.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I know we spent a lot of time in committee talking about a lot of different issues, but maybe the gentleman forgets that we had 3 whole days of hearings on the Davis-Oliver Act, which this bill was included in, and many arguments were made against the Davis-Oliver Act. Most of the arguments that are being made today were not made against this portion of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

□ 0945

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho for yielding. I certainly commend Mrs. COMSTOCK for the outstanding job she has done on this.

I stand here in strong support of this bill. It is absolutely essential that this Congress does everything it can to eradicate and destroy MS–13. It would be shameful not to.

MS–13 has turned my district into killing fields. In the last year and a half, 17 innocent young people have been slaughtered with machetes and knives by MS–13. These are all young people, and these are children of legal and illegal immigrants documented and undocumented. It is the immigrant community that is being turned into a chamber of horrors by MS–13. Children are afraid to go to school; their parents are afraid to allow their kids to go out at night.

There have been 270 arrests in the last year alone. MS–13 is terrorizing communities in my district within 15 to 20 minutes of my home.

I am proud that this bill has been endorsed by the Sergeants Benevolent Association of the NYPD.

Also, when I talk about 17 murders, it is exactly 1 year ago this week that two young teenage girls, Nisa Mickens and Kayla Cuevas, both constituents of mine, were found slaughtered, their bodies desecrated, mutilated, and torn apart by MS–13 because they happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time—no gang connections, nothing whatsoever.

So this is something which has required extensive coordination between the Suffolk County Police Department, ICE, Homeland Security Investigations, Homeland Security, FBI task forces, and the U.S. Attorney's Office all working around the clock to try to eradicate this evil.

But more has to be done, and that is what this bill is about. We cannot allow gang members to be taking advantage of loopholes in the immigration laws. To me, nothing could be more shameful than for us not to do our job. Nothing would be more violative of our role under the Constitution to protect people from all enemies foreign and domestic than for us not to pass legislation such as this. This is absolutely essential. This isn't theoretical, and this is not hypothetical.

For those who are concerned about immigrants and those who are concerned about DACA—and I support DACA—and those who are supportive of the helpless in our society, how can you take any action which would prevent us from going after MS–13? MS–13 is a violent and vicious gang, and if we don't stand together as one, if we continue to make hypothetical arguments or a parade of horribles, we are subjecting and putting more young people—innocent young people—documented and undocumented, in the line of fire and putting them into the killing fields.

I applaud the President, I applaud the Attorney General, and I also support the Democratic leaders in Suffolk County, all of whom have come together in a bipartisan effort to stamp out MS–13. But we must do more. This bill is a major step in that direction. I am proud to support it. I am proud to stand with Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mrs. COMSTOCK in doing this.

This is reality. This isn't make-believe. This isn't something we can dream about, something that may go bad. This is going bad day after day after day in my district and districts throughout the country. These are animals. They need to be eradicated from our society, and this bill is a major step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the bill and urge its adoption.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would just note that this bill was indeed part of the Davis-Oliver Act which did go through the Judiciary Committee. But that bill was over 200 pages long. It had many problems. It was impossible to address all the problems. We would be there for a month if we had gone through line by line. It was not a good process. If it had been perfect, I would note that Chairman GOODLATTE would not have had to have his amendment to remove the reason-to-believe standard that was in the bill that was part of the Davis-Oliver Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is my colleague on the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is as much a criminal injustice bill as it is immigration. Serving as the ranking member on the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, I am both a believer in the dangers of MS–13 as many of my colleagues are. I offer concern and recognition of their violence.

That is why this bill should be defeated because something as crucial as this does not need to be litigated in the courts. You make a bill with such insufferable frailties constitutionally without bipartisanship, without any hearings, and without the ability to set a legal standard of what is the definition or the understanding of a criminal gang.

This is done in consultation with the Attorney General, who is an opponent of any form of immigration, legal or undocumented, consulting with the Homeland Security Secretary of which I am a member of that committee, and the dominant factor will be the Attorney General talking to the Homeland Security Secretary about criminal elements. Who do you think will prevail? How many will be swept up in this expansive, nonorganized, nonorderly, and non-due process legislation?

The frailties of this bill are the very number, if you will, five. Five persons can be called a criminal gang. Mothers and fathers, listen: innocent behavior of young people tattooed or having friends could be called a criminal gang. Yes, individuals who have status could be deported, an ongoing group, club, organizations, or associations. They have expanded this, maybe high school kids who may gather to smoke marijuana. Maybe this would cover sanctuary sites like churches that aid undocumented immigrants.

All we are asking is let us work together to get a bill that fights MS–13, not fights innocent people. The bill defines criminal gang, a group that has been designated as a criminal gang, as I said, by the DHS Secretary in consultation with the Attorney General. It is unwise and irresponsible to not have the kind of organized framework.

That happens from not having committee hearings and markups. It happens when you don't engage police officers in a wide breadth from many different aspects.

I am disappointed that this bill did not have the opportunity to have the

Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations have input, and that would have been done if we had a full hearing or a hearing in the Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee, or a hearing in the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, or a hearing in the full committee as I mentioned.

It lacks a constitutional construct. It begins to criminalize for associations. We are heading down a terribly unsophisticated road. According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's recent report, nationally, 48,000 juvenile offenders were held in residential facilities. We don't need to add more, but here is the outcome: they are not just held, they are deported.

Again, I emphasize to my colleagues that the ages could be very young because there are no firewalls dealing with the ages that might be swept up in this wide sweep of those who deserve to be responded to in a way that is not this bill. This bill pretends to be wrapping up and rounding up bad actors that are undocumented immigrants. That is the big calling card. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues vote against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD ''Fact check: Immigration doesn't bring crime into U.S.,'' by PBS NewsHour.

[From the PBS Newshour, Feb. 3, 2017]

FACT CHECK: IMMIGRATION DOESN'T BRING CRIME INTO U.S. DATA SAY

(By The Conversation)

EDITOR'S NOTE: In his first week in office, President Donald Trump showed he intends to follow through on his immigration promises. A major focus of his campaign was on removing immigrants who, he said, were increasing crime in American communities.

In his acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention, Trump named victims who were reportedly killed by undocumented immigrants and said:

''They are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources . . . We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop the gangs and the violence, and to stop the drugs from pouring into our communities.''

Now as president, he has signed executive orders that restrict entry of immigrants from seven countries into the U.S. and authorize the construction of a wall along the U.S. border with Mexico. He also signed an order to prioritize the removal of ''criminal aliens'' and withhold federal funding from ''sanctuary cities.''

But, what does research say about how immigration impacts crime in U.S. communities? We turned to our experts for answers.

ACROSS 200 METROPOLITAN AREAS

(By Robert Adelman, University at Buffalo, and Lesley Reid, University of Alabama)

Research has shown virtually no support for the enduring assumption that increases in immigration are associated with increases in crime.

Immigration-crime research over the past 20 years has widely corroborated the conclusions of a number of early 20th-century presidential commissions that found no backing for the immigration-crime connection. Although there are always individual exceptions, the literature demonstrates that immigrants commit fewer crimes, on average, than native-born Americans.

Also, large cities with substantial immigrant populations have lower crime rates, on average, than those with minimal immigrant populations.

In a paper published this year in the Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, we, along with our colleagues Gail Markle, Saskia Weiss and Charles Jaret, investigated the immigration-crime relationship.

We analyzed census data spanning four decades from 1970 to 2010 for 200 randomly selected metropolitan areas, which include center cities and surrounding suburbs. Examining data over time allowed us to assess whether the relationship between immigration and crime changed with the broader U.S. economy and the origin and number of immigrants.

The most striking finding from our research is that for murder, robbery, burglary and larceny, as immigration increased, crime decreased, on average, in American metropolitan areas. The only crime that immigration had no impact on was aggravated assault. These associations are strong and stable evidence that immigration does not cause crime to increase in U.S. metropolitan areas, and may even help reduce it.

There are a number of ideas among scholars that explain why more immigration leads to less crime. The most common explanation is that immigration reduces levels of crime by revitalizing urban neighborhoods, creating vibrant communities and generating economic growth.

ACROSS 20 YEARS OF DATA

(By Charis E. Kubrin, University of California, Irvine, and Graham Ousey, College of William and Mary)

For the last decade, we have been studying how immigration to an area impacts crime.

Across our studies, one finding remains clear: Cities and neighborhoods with greater concentrations of immigrants have lower rates of crime and violence, all else being equal.

Our research also points to the importance of city context for understanding the immigration-crime relationship. In one study, for example, we found that cities with historically high immigration levels are especially likely to enjoy reduced crime rates as a result of their immigrant populations.

Findings from our most recent study, forthcoming in the inaugural issue of The Annual Review of Criminology, only strengthen these conclusions.

We conducted a meta-analysis, meaning we systematically evaluated available research on the immigration-crime relationship in neighborhoods, cities and metropolitan areas across the U.S. We examined findings from more than 50 studies published between 1994 and 2014, including studies conducted by our copanelists, Adelman and Reid.

Our analysis of the literature reveals that immigration has a weak crime-suppressing effect. In other words, more immigration equals less crime.

There were some individual studies that found that with an increase in immigration, there was an increase in crime. However, there were 2.5 times as many findings that showed immigration was actually correlated with less crime. And, the most common finding was that immigration had no impact on crime.

The upshot? We find no evidence to indicate that immigration leads to more crime and it may, in fact, suppress it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, opposing this, in particular, I would like to add this letter from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and a letter from the American Immigration Lawyers Association.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, September 13, 2017.

OPPOSE H.R. 3697, THE ''CRIMINAL ALIEN GANG REMOVAL ACT''

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, I am writing to express our opposition to H.R. 3697, which creates new, sweeping grounds for barring entry to or deporting immigrants based on the mere suspicion of gang affiliation. We oppose H.R. 3697 for the following reasons:

It would subject people who have never committed a crime to deportation, creating a new definition of ''criminal gang'' that is unworkably vague and could cover a wide range of organizations ranging from churches to fraternities to political groups. It shifts the burden to individuals to prove they did not know they were affiliated with a gang that committed qualifying offenses, even though proving such a negative is often impossible.

It would expand the use of mandatory, no-bond detention to people facing removal under the bill, even if they have not been convicted of any criminal offenses.

Deportations based on suspected gang membership or affiliation would likely rely on flawed gang databases, which are rife with inconsistent definitions, improper documentation procedures, and inadequate safeguards.

Creating a new ground of deportability for suspected gang members is also unnecessary, because the government already has enough tools and resources to deport such individuals. Most states and the federal government also have laws that punish or enhance sentences for individuals suspected of being gang members, recruiting gang members, or committing crimes while in a gang. In addition, DHS has long prioritized its resources to target suspected gang members for deportation.

H.R. 3697 will disproportionately harm younger immigrants—particularly unaccompanied minors, some of whom flee their home countries to escape gang violence, forced drug trafficking, and sexual violence, and who are at high risk of being coerced to participate in criminal activity. It will also indiscriminately bar these immigrants from asylum, withholding of removal, or other forms of humanitarian relief.

Only a week after the elimination of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, we are deeply disappointed that Congress's first legislative response is to further erode due process protections for immigrants and put them at an even greater risk of deportation. We urge you to oppose H.R. 3697.

Sincerely,

VANITA GUPTA,
President & CEO.

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION LAWYERS ASSOCIATION.

AILA RECOMMENDS VOTE NO ON H.R. 3697—REVISED TO INCLUDE GOODLATTE AMENDMENT, 9/13/2017—''CRIMINAL ALIEN GANG MEMBER REMOVAL ACT''

As the national bar association of over 15,000 immigration lawyers and law professors, AILA recommends that Members of Congress oppose H.R. 3697, the ''Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act.'' The bill is scheduled to come before the House Rules Committee on September 12th and to the floor in the days immediately thereafter.

While Judiciary Chairman GOODLATTE claims that H.R. 3697 is a ''common sense bill to protect our communities,'' in fact the bill will do just the opposite: undermine due process and enable the Trump Administration to deport massive numbers of foreign nationals who pose no threat to our communities or national security. The bill is overbroad and provides government officials with new, expansive powers to detain, deport, and block noncitizens from the United States regardless of whether that individual is suspected of, charged with, or convicted of any specific crime, or whether the individual poses any risk to public safety. The bill does not advance its purported public safety goals, and moreover will place the lives of asylum seekers and other vulnerable individuals at greater risk of harm.

At a time when our nation urgently needs Congress to reform our immigration laws, its leadership has chosen instead to scapegoat immigrants and grant far-reaching enforcement powers to the government that will result in abuse and overreach. More than four years have passed since the Senate passed a comprehensive reform bill. During that time, the House has refused, and still refuses, to address the needs of families and businesses waiting in lengthy backlogs for visas and green cards. The House has yet to bring to a vote a bill that provides a solution for Dreamers and other unauthorized persons. American families, businesses and communities need reform that will strengthen America. H.R. 3697 takes our country in the wrong direction and should be rejected.

Below is a list of the most harmful provisions in H.R. 3697.

H.R. 3697 creates a sweeping, overly-broad definition of ''criminal gang'' in immigration law (Section 2(a)). The bill defines ''criminal gang'' as a group, club or association of five or more people who, within the last five years, had or has as one of its primary purposes the commission of a wide range of conduct including any federally defined felony drug offense, harboring of immigrants (under INA §274), the use of expired identification documents, or obstruction of justice.

The bill's over-inclusive definition imposes criminal liability on non-criminal associations, creating the illusion of a gang where none in fact exists. Under this bill, many groups could qualify as criminal gangs including a church group which elects to offer ''sanctuary'' to an undocumented immigrant or a fraternity whose members use expired identification documents to purchase liquor.

This definition of ''criminal gang'' is broader than the existing federal criminal law sentencing enhancement for ''criminal street gang'' in 18 U.S.C §521(a). The gang definition in H.R. 3697 is also far broader than most state law definitions of criminal gangs. Moreover, INA §101(53) permits the Secretary of DHS, in consultation with the Attorney General, to use the above criteria to designate a ''criminal gang.''

H.R. 3697 adds inadmissibility and deportability grounds that violate due process (Sections 2(b) and 2(c)). H.R. 3697 enables an immigration official to deny admission to a noncitizen if the official has ''reason to believe'' the person is or has ever been a member of a ''criminal gang'' or participated in activities associated with such group. The ''reason to believe'' standard is a low evidentiary standard and does not require a conviction or even an arrest

Under this low standard, the bill will heighten the risk that non-dangerous people will be incorrectly and unfairly classified as gang members. These provisions authorize government officials to target people for their mere association with groups considered to be dangerous rather than for the person's own specific conduct. Authorizing guilt by association has been shown to lead law enforcement to engage in discriminatory enforcement and to depend on unreliable factors as tattoos, style of dress, ethnic background, or neighborhood associations. Under this bill, an immigration official may wrongly label a minor as a gang member for do nothing more than living in a neighborhood with a large number of immigrants and spending time with a suspected gang member or for displaying the flag of his home country.

Goodlatte amendment: The original version of H.R. 3697 submitted to Rules Committee would have allowed this low ''reason to believe'' standard to apply not only to admissions but also to deportations of any noncitizen, including lawful permanent residents. An amendment offered by Chairman GOODLATTE that is now included in the bill removes ''the reason to believe'' standard with respect to deportation. Even with this change, the bill would authorize immigration officials to deport lawful permanent residents that are associated with a group labeled a ''criminal gang,'' including a group that is wrongfully designated as a gang. As revised by the Goodlatte Amendment, the bill still applies the ''reason to believe'' standard to every individual who is seeking admission—which constitutes the vast majority of those who are targeted for enforcement.

H.R. 3697 imposes mandatory detention on anyone, including lawful permanent residents, that an immigration official deems a member of a criminal gang (Sections 2(e) and 2(i)). This provision requires ICE to detain a person regardless of whether that person actually poses a danger to the community Moreover, H.R. 3697 provides no opportunity for the person to appear before a judge to request a custody determination—also known as a bond hearing. In this regard, the bill completely eliminates an immigration Judge's review of the officer's decision—a critical component of due process that prevents unfair government deprivation of liberty.

Any of the people who could be wrongfully labeled as criminal gang members, innocent youth on the street and church members, will be subject to automatic unreviewable detention under this bill. Ensuring that no one is wrongfully detained by the government is a hallmark of American values and the Constitution. This bill tramples upon those principles.

H.R. 3697 threatens protection for vulnerable populations (Sections 2(f), 2(g), 2(h)). H.R. 3697 not only gives broad power to immigration officials to designate harmless people as gang members, but it also renders people merely suspected of gang association ineligible for humanitarian protection such as asylum, Temporary Protected Status, and Special Immigrant Juvenile Status. This bill will prevent bona fide refugees from seeking legal protection in the United States, including children fleeing forced gang recruitment and other victims of abuse encountered by gang members in their home country. This bill could be used to deny these children protection and safe haven in the U.S., deporting them back to their persecutors in violation of U.S. and international legal protections.

America has always been a beacon of hope for those fleeing persecution and oppression. H.R. 3697 will extinguish that beacon by granting extensive powers to the government to detain and deport people who seek protection. AILA urges Congress not to pass legislation that undermines due process protections and would further advance mass deportations of immigrants and other foreign nationals.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. This clearly says this is not a bill against crime, it is a deportation bill.

Save our children, Mr. Speaker. Let's do something different and defeat the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3697, the ''Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act of 2017''.

This bill amends the INA to now include a definition for criminal street gangs as:

An ongoing group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons that has as one of its primary purposes the commission of certain listed offenses, including: a felony drug offense, including felony simple possession of marijuana (this would impact high school kids who may gather to smoke marijuana); bringing in and harboring certain aliens under INA 274 (this would cover sanctuary sites like churches that aid undocumented immigrants); identity fraud offenses (including knowingly possessing a false identity document); crimes involving obstruction of justice; and burglary.

This bill also defines ''criminal gang'': a group that has been designated as a criminal gang by the DHS Secretary in consultation with the Attorney General.

I oppose this unwise and irresponsible legislation because the bill contains several constitutional and procedural defects, and is an unnecessary diversion and distraction from the real issues facing the American people.

As Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Crime Subcommittee, I am highly disappointed that this bill was rushed to the floor without any thorough and thoughtful consideration by the Judiciary Committee.

In particular, there was no markup or hearing on this legislation that has such wide ranging and profound effect on a mass scale.

This bill (1) is constitutionally unsound; (2) has a very low standard of proof; and (3) will result in a sweeping effect among many innocent individuals who have not committed any crime, and thus, raises due process and racial profile concerns.

First, this bill lacks a constitutional construct for how Homeland Security is to determine its designation of a ''criminal street gang''.

I offered an amendment that would have required a uniform legal standard, which will govern the identification of Criminal Street gang members for purposes of ICE enforcement.

According to this bill, 'any' immigrant, including minors, such as a 13 or 14 year old juvenile, would be subject to the harsh penalties of detention and deportation.

If we begin to criminalize for associations then we are heading down a terribly dark road, particularly with youths. Statistics show that the brain does not fully develop until the age of 25. To punish them for mere association based on unsubstantiated evidence is bad legislation.

According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention recent report, nationally, 48,043 juvenile offenders were held in residential placement facilities as of October 28, 2015.

Due to this bill's vague nature, we would add to that alarming number, and further complicates mass incarceration.

Second, the government's mere belief that someone is associated with a criminal gang is sufficient. Given the need for the Department of Homeland Security to come in and deport

any individual, the bar must be higher than mere suspicion and/or belief. There must be a clear and convincing standard under these circumstances.

This bill would capture individuals, even those with permanent residence status; so long as the government believes the individual is associated with a criminal street gang.

Even 13 or 14 year old juveniles that the government may believe are engaging in marijuana use, other drugs, or have association with criminal gangs would be subject to this bill's penalty.

Third, this bill have a sweeping effect given its vague definition and overbroad targets for those who may harbor certain aliens and/or associate with criminal gang members.

This bill has a discriminatory effect in targeting the immigrant community by criminalizing immigration, and thereby, raises due process and racial profiling concerns.

Criminal gangs are very complex and are not exclusive to the immigrant community.

The FBI reports some 33,000 violent street gangs, motorcycle gangs, and prison gangs with about 1.4 million members that are criminally active in the U.S. and Puerto Rico today.

Many are sophisticated and well organized; all use violence to control neighborhoods and boost their illegal moneymaking activities, which include robbery, drug and gun trafficking, prostitution and human trafficking, and fraud.

Strikingly, for this conversation, in these 33,000 street gangs, a significantly larger percentage was non illegal immigrants, unlike the message purported in this bill.

Some of those street gangs include: 211 Crew, American Front, Aryan Brotherhood of Texas, Aryan Circle, Aryan Nation, Aryan Republican Army, Born to Kill, Dead Man Incorporated, European Kindred, just to name a few here that are mainly white supremacist gang groups. We could go on, as gangs are found everywhere, in almost every ethnic group.

As legislators on the Judiciary Committee, we argue vigorously on behalf of the American people, as is the case in any other Committee; and in doing so, we will sometimes disagree.

So to suggest that we would not have been able to debate the merits of this bill, so instead bypass the regular process is disheartening.

Are we passionate about the issues that impact our legislative process, governance, and the American people? Yes we are! And we will continue to probe vigorously, as a legislative body having jurisdiction, notwithstanding the subject matter.

We will not stay quiet as to not offend a few when so many issues with catastrophic consequences may result if we don't speak up.

So Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies for doing my job and questioning where necessary on behalf of the American people.

We should be having vigorous debate on matters such as jobs, schools, health care, victims of Charlottesville, victims of climate change, building bridges, healing broken communities, and bringing this country together for ''all'' the American people, we are instead debating a damaged bill in order to advance the President's campaign promise on mass deportation, thus, distracting us from the people's business.

My amendments attempted to fix some of the glaring defects in this bill. In its current form, it is bad for our country and does not keep our communities safe, but instead does the opposite.

For all the reasons stated above, I oppose this bill.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I agree. We should save our children. We need to start deporting some criminal gang members.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who is the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho and the chair of our subcommittee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3697, the Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act.

Transnational criminal gangs have declared war on the United States. Their tactics of intimidation and unspeakable mutilation and killing have permeated most every part of our country, including multiple instances in my own district. Most recently in Bedford County, Virginia, a young man was killed by alien members of MS–13.

The Department of Homeland Security reports an ever-growing number of criminal aliens joining international gangs, such as MS–13, which alone has over 10,000 members within our borders. Whether these criminals came to this country illegally as unaccompanied minors, adults, or have valid visas or even green cards, it is time to send the message that this behavior will simply not be tolerated.

Yet current immigration law includes no provision allowing for the removal of criminal gang members based on their membership in dangerous gangs or participation in gang activities. The result is unconscionable. ICE must sit on the sidelines and wait for known gang members to be arrested and convicted of specific offenses before removal proceedings may commence. Of course, with many victims and witnesses too petrified of retaliation against them and their families to cooperate with police, many gang members are never convicted of their crimes.

This legislation provides a crucial tool so that ICE can seek to remove alien gang members before they are able to extort businesses and murder innocent Americans.

In addition, this bill allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate organizations as criminal gangs utilizing the same transparent procedures used by the Secretary of State to designate foreign terrorist organizations. Finally, the bill ensures that criminal alien gang members cannot receive asylum and be released back onto our streets able to resume their criminal activities while being eligible for a vast array of Federal benefits.

Eradicating the death grip that transnational criminal alien gangs hold over many of our communities, especially immigrant communities, is an important piece of immigration reform. I am pleased that this bill, which stems from legislation that the House has approved in the past and which has been approved by the Judiciary Committee in multiple Congresses, is being considered today.

Now, I want to address the allegation that this bill targets priests, nuns, and garage band members. It is preposterous. This bill deliberately includes the longstanding Federal criminal offenses for alien smuggling as predicates for criminal gang activity. Coyotes and other criminal gangs make billions of dollars and put countless lives at risk through their alien smuggling activities.

As former U.S. Attorney David Iglesias, who emigrated to the United States from Latin America as a child, stated: ''Smuggling aliens across our borders is a dangerous business. All too often, people entrust their lives to smugglers, only to die in the broiling desert, or suffocate in the back of locked, airless trucks while the smugglers profit.''

''These smuggling rings, which facilitate illegal entry into the United States and mercilessly exploit human beings for money, are a danger to immigrants and a threat to our national security. . . .''

The Democrats are engaging in a huge amount of obfuscation. In the past, House Democrats claimed the House passed legislation that would have strengthened Federal alien smuggling laws, would have had the effect of putting priests and nuns at risk of prosecution. The Democrats' clear implication was that these problems didn't exist under then-current law which remains current law.

Let me quote. Democrat members of the House Judiciary Committee, including JOHN CONYERS, JERRY NADLER, ZOE LOFGREN, and SHEILA JACKSON LEE, they stated that the bill then under consideration goes far beyond increasing penalties for alien smuggling and jeopardizes the well-being of millions of Americans, neighbors, family members, faith institutions, and others who live and work with undocumented immigrants.

Former Speaker PELOSI, the current minority leader, stated: ''Under the guise of an expansive definition of smuggling,''—the bill—''it could make criminals out of Catholic priests and nuns, ministers, rabbis, and social service workers who provide assistance and acts of charity to those in need.''

The Democrats can't have it both ways. They can't argue one day that we can't change current law because that would result in putting priests and nuns at risk and argue the next day that, without any evidence, current law already puts them at risk. To add to the hypocrisy, the House Democrats supported an amendment which passed by voice vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Virginia an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. So to add to the controversy, the House Democrats supported an amendment which passed by voice vote to add human smuggling to the list of predicate acts under the Federal money laundering statute.

□ 1000

The Department of Justice and Immigration and Customs Enforcement simply do not target clergy and others who do not make distinctions based on immigration status when serving those in spiritual or material need.

The use of such laws against religious organizations and other humanitarian groups has been practically nonexistent. Of course, as in the sanctuary movement in the 1980s, when religious organizations engage in the smuggling of illegal aliens into the United States, they would be subject to prosecution, just as anyone else would be.

This bill is based upon the same precedent that has been passed through this House by voice vote dealing with human smuggling. It is time to apply the same standard to alien gang members who are perpetrating violence not just on people traveling to the United States, as in the case of human smuggling, but on the citizens of virtually every State in the Union.

The murders that have been outlined by Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. COMSTOCK of Virginia, Mr. LABRADOR of Idaho, and others are taking place all across the country because we simply are not removing from this country as expeditiously as possible members of gangs like MS–13. It is time to get about doing that, and this bill does that.

I want to commend Representative BARBARA COMSTOCK; Representative PETER KING; and the chairman of our Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee, Representative RAUL LABRADOR, for their work on this important bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3697.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an analysis entitled: ''Harboring: Overview of the Law,'' prepared by the Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.

[From the Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.]

HARBORING: OVERVIEW OF THE LAW

The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) prohibits individuals from concealing, shielding, or harboring unauthorized individuals who come into and remain in the United States. Under the law it is a criminal offense punishable by a fine or imprisonment for any person who:

knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact than an alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of law, conceals, harbors, or shields from detection, or attempts to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection, such alien in any place, including any building or any means of transportation. INA §274(a)(1)(A)(iii), 8 U.S.C. 1324(a)(1)(A)(iii) [hereinafter the ''harboring provision'' or ''Section 1324 (a)'']. THE HARBORING PROHIBITION APPLIES TO EVERYONE

The harboring prohibition is not restricted to those individuals who are in the business of smuggling undocumented immigrants into the United States or who employ undocumented immigrants in sweatshop-like conditions. As interpreted by the courts, harboring can apply to any person who knowingly harbors an undocumented immigrant. *See, e.g., United States v. Shum*, 496 F.3d 390 (5th Cir. 2007); *United States v. Zheng*, 306 F.3d 1080, 1085 (11th Cir. 2002), *cert denied*, 538 U.S. 925 (2003); *United States v. Kim*, 193 F.3d 567, 573–74 (2d Cir. 1999); *United States v. Rubio-Gonzalez*, 674 F.2d 1067, 1073 (5th Cir. 1982); *United States v. Cantu*, 557 F.2d 1173, 1180 (5th Cir. 1977), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 1063 (1978).

WHAT ARE THE ELEMENTS OF HARBORING?

To establish a violation of the harboring provision, the government must prove the following in most jurisdictions ''(1) the alien entered or remained in the United States in violation of the law, (2) the defendant concealed, harbored, or sheltered the alien in the United States, (3) the defendant knew or recklessly disregarded that the alien entered or remained in the United States in violation of the law, and (4) the defendant's conduct tended to substantially facilitate the alien remaining in the United States illegally.'' *Shum*, 496 F.3d at 391–392 (quoting *United States v. De Jesus-Batres*, 410 F 3d 154, 160 (5th Cir. 2005), *cert denied*, 546 U.S. 1097 (2006)). The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit has rejected the fourth element asserting that the phrase ''conduct tending substantially to facilitate'' is a judicial addition to the statute that is unnecessary for a conviction because the statute requires no specific degree of assistance. *United States v. Xiang Hui Ye*, 588 F.3d 411, 415–416 (7th Cir. 2009).

WHAT ACTIONS CONSTITUTE HARBORING?

Although Congress passed legislation to prohibit and punish the ''harboring'' of undocumented individuals, it never defined the term. The work of defining what constitutes ''harboring'' has been left to the courts. As shown below, the federal courts have not settled on one uniform definition, but rather many of the circuit courts have adopted their own definition of ''harboring.''

Harboring is conduct that substantially facilitates an immigrant's remaining in the U.S. illegally and that prevents the authorities from detecting the individual's unlawful presence (U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit)

Harboring includes affirmative conduct such as providing shelter, transportation, direction about how to obtain false documentation, or warnings about impending investigations that facilitates a person's continuing illegal presence in the United States. (U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit)

Harboring is conduct tending to substantially facilitate an immigrant's remaining in the U.S. illegally (U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit)

Harboring is conduct that clandestinely shelters, succors, and protects improperly admitted immigrants. (U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit)

Harboring is conduct that provides or offers a known undocumented individual a secure haven, a refuge, a place to stay in which authorities are unlikely to be seeking him. (U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit)

Harboring is conduct that affords shelter to undocumented individuals. (U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit)

EXPLANATION OF HARBORING THROUGH CASE LAW

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

In the influential case, *United States v. Lopez*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit went through the legislative history of the harboring provision and stated that the term harbor ''was intended to encompass conduct tending substantially to facilitate an alien's 'remaining in the United States illegally,' provided that the person charged has knowledge of the immigrant's unlawful status.'' 521 F.2d 437, 441 (2d Cir 1975), *cert. denied*, 423 U.S. 995 (1975).

In this case, Mr. Lopez owned at least six homes in Nassau County, New York, where he operated safe havens for undocumented individuals. Mr. Lopez knew that the people staying in his homes were undocumented. Each person paid Mr. Lopez $15 per week to live in his houses. In many cases, people received the address for a particular house before they left their home countries, and, upon crossing the border illegally, they proceeded directly to the house. Mr. Lopez also helped these individuals obtain jobs by completing work applications and transporting them to and from work. He arranged sham marriages for many so that they could appear to be in the U.S. in lawful status. With a warrant, immigration authorities searched six of Lopez's homes and found twenty-seven undocumented individuals. He was charged with harboring illegal immigrants.

Mr. Lopez argued that the mere providing of shelter to undocumented immigrants does not constitute harboring. *Id.* at 439. He argued that to constitute harboring the conduct must be part of the process of smuggling immigrants into the U.S. or facilitating the immigrants' illegal entry into the U.S. *Id.* The circuit court noted that he essentially argued that to constitute harboring the sheltering would have to be provided either clandestinely or for the purposes of sheltering the immigrants from the authorities. *Id.*

The Second Circuit rejected these arguments. It held that the statute criminalizes conduct that tends substantially to facilitate an alien's remaining in the United States illegally. *Id.* at 441. The circuit court found that Mr. Lopez's conduct did just that. It pointed out that Mr. Lopez had a large number of undocumented immigrants living at his houses; they obtained the addresses and, upon entering the U.S., proceeded to those houses; Mr. Lopez provided transportation for them to and from work; and, he helped arrange sham marriages. *Id.* The Second Circuit did not require that Mr. Lopez provide the shelter clandestinely nor that he shield the illegal immigrants from detection by immigration authorities *Id.*

The case of *United States v. Kim* also is instructive on the meaning of harboring. 193 F.3d 567 (2d Cu 1999). It states that harboring within the meaning of Section 1324(a) ''encompasses conduct tending substantially to facilitate an alien's remaining in the U.S. illegally and to prevent government authorities from detecting [the immigrant's] unlawful presence.'' *Id.* at 574. In this case, Mr. Myung Ho Kim owned and operated a garment-manufacturing business called ''Sewing Masters'' in New York City. He employed a number of undocumented workers, including Nancy Fanfar. During the course of her employment, Mr. Kim instructed Ms. Fanfar to bring in new papers with a different name that would indicate that she had work authorization. He instructed Ms. Fanfar to change her name and remain in his employ a second time, even while he was being investigated by immigration authorities.

According to the circuit court, Mr. Kim's actions constituted harboring, for they were designed to help Ms. Fanfar remain in his employ and to prevent her continued presence from being detected by the authorities. Thus, his conduct substantially facilitated her ability to remain in the U.S. illegally in prohibition of the harboring provision. *Id.* at 574–575.

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

The Third Circuit also has considered what conduct constitutes ''shielding,'' ''harboring,'' and ''concealing'' within the meaning of Section 1324(a). Like the Second Circuit, it determined that these terms encompass conduct ''tending to substantially facilitate an alien's remaining in the U.S. illegally'' and [that] prevent[s] government authorities from detecting the alien's unlawful presence. ''*U.S. v. Ozcelik*, 527 F.3d 88, 100 (3d Cir. 2008); see also *Delno-Mocci v. Connolly Props*, 672 F.3d 241, 246 (3d Cir. 2012), *U.S. v. Cuevas-Reyes*, 572 F.3d 119, 122 (3d Cir. 2009); *U.S. v. Silveus*, 542 F.3d 993, 1003 (3d Cir. 2008).

In *United States v. Ozcelik*, the defendant knew that the individual remained in the U.S. illegally and advised him to ''lay low'' and ''stay away'' from the address he had on file with the government. 527 F.3d at 100. However, Mr. Ozcelik did not actively attempt to intervene or delay an impending immigration investigation and the Third Circuit held that advising an individual without legal status to stay out of trouble and to keep a low profile does not tend substantially to facilitate their remaining in the country. *Id.* at 100–01. The circuit court reasserted that shielding or harboring a person without status ordinarily includes affirmative conduct such as providing shelter, transportation, direction about how to obtain false documentation, or warnings about impending investigations that facilitates a person's continuing illegal presence in the United States. *See Id.* at 99.

In *United States v. Silveus*, the Third Circuit held that cohabitation, along with reasonable control of premises during an immigration agent's inquiry regarding the whereabouts of the suspected undocumented individual, does not constitute harboring without sufficient evidence that a defendant's conduct substantially facilitated the individual's remaining in the U.S. illegally and prevented authorities from detecting his/her unlawful presence. 542 F.3d at 1002–04. In this case, the agent never saw the suspected undocumented individual, but only heard the apartment door slam, heard some bushes break, and as he approached, saw the defendant shut her front door. *Id.* at 1002. The defendant spoke to the agent through her window and when asked if anybody had run out of her apartment, she said ''I don't know.'' *Id.* at 1003. The circuit court determined that the act of shutting a door as an agent rounded the corner and her subsequent reply to the agent's question did not establish ''harboring'' under Section 1324(a) because it only led to speculation as to the suspect's presence. *Id.* at 1004.

In *United States v. Cuevas-Reyes*, the Third Circuit reaffirmed that shielding an undocumented person includes affirmative conduct (such as providing shelter, transportation, direction about how to obtain false documents, or warnings about impending investigations) that facilitates the person's continuing illegal presence in the U.S. 572 F.3d at 122. The circuit court held that the defendant's actions (taking undocumented people from the U.S. to the Dominican Republic in his private plane) were undertaken for the purpose of removing them from the U.S., not helping them remain in the U.S. *Id.* It noted that the goal of Section 1324 is to prevent undocumented individuals from entering or remaining illegally in the U.S. by punishing those that shield or harbor. *Id.* It asserted that punishing a defendant for helping individuals without legal status leave the U.S. would be contrary to that goal. *Id.*

More recently, the Third Circuit reiterated that ''harboring'' requires some act that obstructs the government's ability to discover the undocumented person and that it is highly unlikely that landlords renting apartments to people lacking lawful status could, without more, satisfy the court's definition of harboring. *Delrio-Mocci*, 672 F.3d at 246 (citing *Lozano v. City of Hazleton*, 620 F.3d 170, 223 (3d Cir 2010)). The circuit court reiterated that ''[r]enting an apartment in the normal course of business is not in and of itself conduct that prevents the government from detecting an alien's presence.'' *Id.*

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

The Fifth Circuit's definition of harboring is broader than the Second and Third Circuits. It rejects the notion that to be convicted of harboring a defendant's conduct must be part of a smuggling operation or involve actions that hide immigrants from law enforcement authorities. *See De Jesus-Batres*, 410 F.3d at 162 (specific intent is not an element of the offense of harboring). An early Fifth Circuit decision, *U.S. v. Cantu*, 557 F.2d 1173 (5th Cir. 1977), remains informative.

In *Cantu*, immigration agents visited the restaurant owned by Mr. Cantu because they received information that he was employing undocumented workers. The agents wanted to question the employees. Mr. Cantu refused admission to his restaurant until they could provide a warrant.

While the immigration authorities waited outside for the warrant, Mr. Cantu made arrangements with at least two of his patrons to drive some of his undocumented employees into town. Mr. Cantu also arranged for his employees to sit in the restaurant and then leave the restaurant like customers. As the employees left the restaurant, the immigration agents approached them and questioned them about their immigration status. The agents determined their illegal status and arrested them.

Mr. Cantu argued that, because he did not instruct his employees to ''hide,'' and because the employees left the restaurant in full view of the officers, he could not be charged with shielding immigrants from detection. He also argued that his actions were not connected to any smuggling activity. The Fifth Circuit, relying on the Second Circuit's Lopez decision, rejected these arguments, and determined that Mr. Cantu's actions—instructing the employees to act like customers so they could evade arrest—tended to facilitate the immigrants remaining in the U.S. illegally. *Id.* at 1180.

In another Fifth Circuit case, *United States v. Varkonyi*, 645 F.2d 453 (5th Cir. 1981), the court cited to Lopez to assert that the harboring statute prohibits ''any conduct which tends to substantially facilitate an alien's remaining in the U.S. illegally.'' *Id.* at 459. Mr. Varkonyi provided a group of undocumented immigrants with steady employment at his scrap metal yard six days a week as well as lodging at his warehouse. On previous occasions, he had instructed and aided the men in avoiding detection and apprehension. On the day of their detention, Mr. Varkonyi interfered with Customs and Border Protection agents' actions by forcibly denying them entry to his property through physical force.

Here, the circuit court found that Mr. Varkonyi's conduct went well beyond mere employment and thus constituted harboring. *Id.* at 459. In this case, the court pointed out that Mr. Varkonyi knew of the immigrants' undocumented status, he had instructed the immigrants on avoiding detection on a prior occasion; he was providing the immigrants with employment and lodging, he interfered with immigration agents to protect the immigrants from apprehension; and he was partly responsible for the escape of one of the immigrants from custody. *Id.* Given these facts, the circuit court found that Mr. Varkonyi's conduct, both before and after the detention of the immigrants, was calculated to facilitate the immigrants remaining in the U.S. unlawfully. *Id.* at 460.

In 2007, the Fifth Circuit ruled in another employment harboring case that ''substantially facilitate'' means to make an individual's illegal presence in the United States substantially ''easier or less difficult.'' *United States v. Shum*, 496 F.3d 390, 392 (5th Cir. 2007) (citations and quotation marks omitted). The court noted that Section 1324(a) was enacted to deter employers from hiring unauthorized individuals and it refused to adopt a narrow definition of ''substantially facilitate'' that undermines Congress's purpose. *Id.*

In this case, Mr. Shum was vice-president of an office-cleaning company and he employed janitors without legal status. According to witnesses, he provided false identifications to the workers to facilitate background checks so that the workers could clean government office buildings.

Ms. LOFGREN. In this legal analysis by the Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc., it does point out that religious persons have been prosecuted and convicted for providing sanctuary. Opinions may differ on whether that is a good idea or bad idea, but to say that that is an MS–13 activity, I think we would all agree that is just crazy. That is what this bill would do.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), a freshman Member of the House whom we are so fortunate to have. Just last year, as the chief of police, she was on the front line in the fight against gangs.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Madam Speaker, I spent 27 years as a law enforcement officer. I had the honor of working my way up through the ranks to become the chief of police. I co-chaired an antigang task force for the State of Florida. As chief, I launched an all-out war against violent crime. Through the hard work of a lot of good men and women, we were able to reduce violent crime by 40 percent.

Do I take gang activity very seriously? You better believe I do. I have the record to prove that.

The spirit of H.R. 3697, with this broad, new definition of what constitutes a gang, has nothing, based on my experience on the ground, to do with curtailing gang activity.

As a former law enforcement officer who has been there on the front lines, there is no way I would vote for this law. This law targets a group of people based on their status and does not target criminal activity. That is what law enforcement officers do.

We all take gang activity seriously. I heard the question earlier: Who would favor gangs? Who really would favor gangs?

I invite my colleagues on the other side to join me in continuing our aggressive efforts to target criminal behavior, because that is really what we want to stop—criminal behavior—and not profile or target people. That is just not who we are.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I just want to make a couple of closing comments on this bill.

I think it is a given that every Member of this body wants to do something about gangs. I have gangs in my district. I think I heard Mr. KING speak so passionately about the problem in his district. It is a pervasive problem.

The concern is that this bill goes far beyond targeting those gangs. That is why we, with great reluctance, have to say we can't do this. We can't do this.

If we wanted to target just the gangs, we wouldn't have included language that would allow charging people who are not gang members as gang members. We wouldn't have included provisions that the victims of gangs would be denied asylum. Section 2(f) of the bill denies individuals who are suspected of alleged gang membership the opportunity to apply for asylum.

Here is the problem. In certain parts of Central America, you have rampant gang activity. Women and girls are terribly abused. They are beaten, turned into sex slaves, tattooed, and they escape. If that young girl who has been the victim of that violence from gangs comes with the tattoos, the brand that that gang put on her, and if she, as a consequence, is reasonably suspected of being a member of the gang, she can't get asylum. That is not what we want in the fight against MS–13.

The bill is not drafted adequately.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LABRADOR. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, in 2014, four MS–13 gang members brutally murdered a 14-year-old boy from Texas with a machete. Just this year, two MS–13 gang members laughed and waved at the cameras as they faced trial in a Houston courtroom for the kidnapping, rape, and murder of young girls. These are just two examples that reflect the horrific and gruesome reality of what gangs across this country are capable of.

There are as many as 100,000 gang members in my home State of Texas, several of whom are linked to Mexican cartels, who help them distribute drugs and traffic people and weapons. Nearly 60 percent of identified prison gang members in Texas are serving sentences for violent crimes, including homicide, robbery, and assault.

MS–13 is one of the most dangerous gangs in our State, with almost 500 members throughout Texas. They have been described by the Houston police chief as a ''transnational terrorist organization,'' the ''worst of the worst,'' and a ''cancer.'' It is State and local law enforcement officers like him, as well gang task forces, who are on the front lines, putting their own lives in danger to deal with these heinous criminals.

Today, I rise in support of Mrs. COMSTOCK's bill, which will do what we should have been doing a long time ago, and that is giving local entities the ability to expeditiously deport gang members who are here illegally and ensure they never are able to come back to the United States.

Our first job is to keep Americans safe. H.R. 3697 certainly improves the prospects of that.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California). The gentlewoman from California has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Idaho has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It has been mentioned that there are terrible activities being undertaken by gang members. I don't think there is any dispute in this body about that. Our obligation is to craft bills that will allow for remedies for that problem in a specific, targeted, and effective way. I think this bill falls far short in that regard.

We had mentioned earlier the great concern that has been expressed to us by religious people across the United States about the provisions relative to harboring. Five nuns on a religious worker visa who help provide sanctuary for an undocumented person is a gang under this bill. They are not MS–13.

We could craft a measure that avoids that outcome while still going after MS–13. We didn't do that. For one thing, we didn't actually sit down, both sides of the aisle, to work together, to reason together, to make that happen.

I would like to note that the smuggling issue is a big problem. We have unanimous agreement on the smuggling issue. We have worked together, actually, with the Wilberforce Act and other acts in a bipartisan way to deal with that. But we didn't bifurcate smuggling from harboring in this bill. That is why the nuns and the Catholic bishops have contacted us asking us not to support this bill.

I would like to note, just finally, that the first obligation that we have is to keep America safe. We fail to do that if we craft language that really is just part of a broad deportation agenda under the guise of an antigang bill. There is great concern that is what has happened here.

One of the elements that is referenced as a predicate for gang activity—the five people who are working together—is that documents are false. A lot of people are highly agitated when undocumented people have false documents. Opinions differ. Almost every undocumented person in the United States who works has a fake ID; otherwise, they can't get a job.

You can agree with that, you can think it is terrible, you can think it is maybe not so terrible. I think most of us would agree it is not MS–13. Why would we craft this in such a way to treat that activity as an MS–13 activity and to blow up all the procedures we have in place to make sure that justice is done?

I hope that Members will vote against this bill. Despite the name, it goes far beyond attacking gangs. It would drift into allowing for the deportation of religious people and others who have done nothing related to gang activity.

I hope that, if this bill is defeated, we can sit down, as we often have on various items and worked collaboratively on patent reform and other issues, and do the same on this. I hope, if this bill is defeated, we will take the opportunity to do that.

I, for one, pledge my best efforts to come up with a measure that is targeted and effective. This bill, unfortunately, is not.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I keep hearing again and again and again that there is no dispute about ongoing violence or gang violence in the United States, but what has been clear from today's argument is that our friends on the other side just don't want to do anything about it. They are willing to talk about the gang violence, but they don't want to actually craft and pass legislation that does something about it.

□ 1015

I hope it is something that the American people are listening to, because as we have debates over the next few months about what we should be doing with regard to immigration, I hope everyone understands that every time we try to do something about enforcement of immigration laws, about stopping gang violation, about stopping illegal immigration into the United States, it is very difficult to get agreement on the other side.

Criminal alien gang members are wreaking havoc in this country. Without stronger tools to specifically target those aliens that terrorize our streets, gangs will continue to grow in numbers and in strength.

The time has come to take action and to provide a path to deportation to those that so unabashedly seek to destroy our society.

ICE has found that ''membership of these violent transnational gangs is comprised largely of foreign-born nationals.'' Often bearing the brunt of these gangs' violence are these very immigrant communities that the other side claims that they want to protect.

The Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act takes a tough approach. I agree with that. Those gang members who have successfully evaded prosecution through witness intimidation, employing the tactics of fear and violence, will now be within ICE's reach. The new grounds of removability provided by H.R. 3697 will get criminal gang members off of our streets.

ICE's recent Operation New Dawn resulted in almost 1,100 arrests of gang

members. Had H.R. 3697 been enacted prior, that number would have almost certainly increased.

This bill is only starting the removal process, however. Make no mistake—and there was a lot of obfuscation today about this—immigration proceedings do not equate to deportation. The government must prove its case and provide evidence to convince an immigration judge that gang-related activity occurred.

As a former private immigration attorney, I have seen this process in action, and it does work. ICE will not use this new charge as pretext, as this ground will never be sustained by an immigration judge without sufficient evidence.

The time for this bill is long overdue, and we cannot afford to be distracted by extreme hypotheticals and issues not germane to what we are discussing today.

This bill was introduced to target criminal gangs, as that term is commonly understood, and that is what it will do once enacted. There is no place in our country for criminal alien gang members. By removing them from our streets, H.R. 3697 will help make our communities safer. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, H.R. 3697 is yet another exercise in false advertising by the Majority. Named the "Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act," this legislation is so overbroad that it would lead to the deportation of immigrants with absolutely no criminal record and would apply to individuals with no connection to gangs.

In short, this blatantly anti-immigration legislation casts a wide and dangerous net in furtherance of President Trump's mass deportation agenda. I say this for several reasons.

To begin with, H.R. 3967 authorizes the Trump Administration to brand a group of immigrants a "gang" without requiring a conviction or even an arrest.

In fact, it would allow individuals to be deported or denied admission based on a mere "belief"—however tenuous—of their connection to unlawful activity.

In addition, the bill's definition of a "gang" is so broad that it would apply to individuals who clearly are not members of criminal gangs.

I doubt that my Republican colleagues really believe that 5 Christian ministers providing shelter to undocumented immigrants constitute a criminal gang.

But by voting for this measure, that's precisely what lawmakers would turn them into. The bill instantly places such religious workers throughout America—from nuns to rabbis, imams to priests—into the same classification as MS–13.

Finally, we are rushing this deeply flawed legislation through the House today while nearly 800,000 young people—800,000 law abiding members of our communities—are facing deportation in as little as 6 months.

These are young people who are as American as any of us. They have grown up in our communities, attended our schools, and have become our neighbors, our teachers, first responders, doctors, and lawyers. But because of action taken by President Trump last week, they now are living in fear and uncertainty.

There is a bipartisan bill with overwhelming support across the country that would allow these young people to remain in the United States the only home most have ever known—and continue contributing to our communities and our economy.

But that bill, the DREAM Act, has languished for years.

Nevertheless, instead of taking up the DREAM Act, we are rushing H.R. 3697 through just days after it was introduced and without any hearings, markups, or the opportunity for amendment.

This House should stop jamming through pieces of the Trump mass deportation plan and instead recommit itself to lifting up the young people of our communities by passing the DREAM act.

It is what's right for our economy, our Nation and it is our moral responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 3697.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act.

Remarkably, under current law, membership in a criminal street gang does not in and of itself make a non-citizen inadmissible or deportable from the United States.

This common-sense bill corrects this dangerous loophole by requiring that criminal alien gang members be deported swiftly and never allowed back into the United States.

It provides law enforcement with another tool in their arsenal to combat dangerous and deadly criminal gangs—like MS–13. Criminal gangs benefit from loopholes in our immigration laws and today we are taking an important step to close the door to the United States for non-citizen criminal gang members.

Over the past 12 months, several thousand criminal aliens who were confirmed members of gangs were removed from the United States by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). This year ICE is continuing its focus on making our streets safer by removing criminal gang members with a particular focus on MS–13 members.

It is past time that we strengthen our immigration laws, deport criminal aliens and secure our borders. We have a duty to make America safe for its citizens and H.R. 3697 is an important step in that direction.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 513, 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

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Beyer moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3697 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. ___. PROTECTING INNOCENT RELIGIOUS WORKERS FROM DEPORTATION.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act may be construed to authorize the deportation of an alien for action taken on behalf of a religious organization whose primary purpose is the provision of humanitarian assistance or aid.

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

Mr. BEYER. Madam 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.

I offer this amendment to recommit to reveal the flaws in the bill. The sponsor of this bill, Mrs. COMSTOCK and I both represent northern Virginia, and she and I both want to eliminate gang violence. MS–13 is a menace to society, and I endorse the goal of destroying it through legal means, but this bill wouldn't do that.

This bill will promote widespread racial profiling. It will violate First Amendment protections. It will expand mandatory detention of immigrants. It will raise serious constitutional questions on judicial review of government designation of certain groups. And it bars humanitarian relief for individuals in violation of international treaties.

I take gang violence and MS–13 very seriously. The young man Mrs. COMSTOCK referred to, found dead in a park in my city of Alexandria, was actually found by a dear family friend. But we can do this in a bill that doesn't promote racial profiling or violate the Constitution.

So in this motion to recommit, we offer language to get at one of the most glaring flaws in this bill that it can go after humanitarian workers. The Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act creates an overly broad definition of a criminal gang by allowing DHS to essentially designate any individual as a gang member.

As written, it could cover a wide range of organizations ranging from churches to fraternities, to political groups. This will allow ICE to target people who may or may not appear to be in a gang and charge all those who seem in any way connected to individual members of a gang.

Religious workers who are engaged in immigrant ministry could be subject to prosecution. Immigrant ministry is not smuggling in airless trucks. In my district, we have a number of faith communities who provide for the unemployed, the homeless, those without language. Already, ICE swept up half a dozen men as they exited a church service. Under this bill, the pastor could be next.

If a nun, through her work, interacts with a potential gang member, she, by the context of this bill, could be a gang

member. It is not accidental that the Catholic bishops and the nuns have written to oppose this bill. The harboring provisions are so sweeping, the religious workers who provide shelter, transportation, or support to undocumented immigrants could be found liable of criminal activity. And this is not transportation across the U.S. border. This is transportation to work or to English lesson classes.

It is incredibly concerning that it would subject people who have never committed a crime, never been arrested, never been indicted, to deportation; and it would apply retroactively. Indeed, mere suspicion of involvement in harboring could classify individuals as gang members.

So it is very obvious here that humanitarian exemption is needed, but that is not the only concern with this bill language. The overly broad definition would empower immigrant authorities to conduct dragnet sweeps of Latino communities and other communities of color.

Media reports make it clear that law enforcement has recently relied on questionable and unreliable evidence to assert that Latino individuals are gang members, including wearing certain kinds of clothes or doodling in an area code from a Latin American country on a school notebook.

Officers have alleged gang membership sometimes based on merely being seen with people who are alleged gang members or living in neighborhoods known to suffer gang activity. This expansive language could and will sweep up people who have committed no criminal activity whatsoever.

As a representative of Virginia, a State with a long and troubled history with race, I think we need to be very careful before we implement policies that allow for structural racism. This bill has many more flaws, which general debate covered. But I want to be clear, before we pass this bill and start locking up nuns and priests and other religious workers, we should not continue this one-dimensional conversation on immigration policy.

We cannot focus only on enforcement and a mass deportation agenda. It doesn't fix our immigration system. We have got to work on comprehensive immigration reform, and we begin with the President's recent decision to eliminate DACA and put Congress on the clock. We should be acting today to protect our DREAMers. 800,000 young immigrants'—not members of MS–13—lives depend on it. I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Madam Speaker, in 2015, at an Alexandria playground in Mr. BEYER's district, 8 miles from this Capitol, the body of a 24-year-old man was left nearly decapitated in a grisly murder by one of the thousands of MS–13 gang members in our country. I should also mention that that victim was also an MS–13 gang member.

This very Capital region has the second highest number of MS–13 gang members. Criminal alien gang members are growing in numbers in our region around the country and wrecking havoc in my district and in this very region. Without stronger tools to specifically target those specific aliens—this bill targets them—that terrorize our streets, gangs like MS–13 will then continue to grow in numbers and strength if we aren't targeting them. The time has come to take action and provide a path for deportation for violent criminal gang members.

ICE has found that membership of these violent transnational gangs is comprised largely of foreign-born nationals. Often bearing the brunt of these gangs' violence are the very immigrant communities in which they reside. They target their own communities. We have seen that in my region and in my district, and that is why this is so troubling.

The Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act will address this. Those gang members who have successfully evaded prosecution through witness intimidation, employing the tactics of fear and violence will now be within ICE's reach. The new grounds of removability provided by H.R. 3697 will help get criminal gang members off our streets.

ICE's recent Operation New Dawn has resulted in almost 1,100 arrests of gang members. Had this bill been enacted prior, that number could have increased. This bill is only starting the removal process, however.

Make no mistake, regular immigration proceedings will still apply. The government must prove its case and provide evidence to convince an immigration judge. This bill preserves all due process and appellate rights afforded to any alien facing deportation.

The time for this bill is long overdue. It was introduced to target criminal gangs, as that term is commonly understood, and that is what it will do once it is enacted.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this motion to recommit, to vote for the base bill, H.R. 3697, and to provide ICE with the tools it needs to keep dangerous criminal alien gang members off our streets, out of our communities, and out of our country.

Madam 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 noes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 220, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

YEAS—184

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

NAYS—220

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

Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—29

Bridenstine
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Olson
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Sinema
Tiberi
Yoho

□ 1050

Messrs. FARENTHOLD, LEWIS of Minnesota, and COLLINS of New York changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mses. McCOLLUM and SEWELL of Alabama, Messrs. KENNEDY, HOYER, GUTIÉRREZ, HIGGINS of New York, and McNERNEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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 ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, and I have never seen this bill before. Under regular order, it should go to our committee for a hearing and for a markup. Has this bill had a hearing and a markup in any committee, or has it just sprung on this floor like something out of the ocean in Greek mythology?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is counting for the yeas and nays. The gentleman's inquiry will not be entertained.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 175, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

YEAS—233

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kihuen
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rosen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Russell
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
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
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—175

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

NOT VOTING—25

Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Pelosi
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Tiberi
Yoho

□ 1059

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3354.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1101

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, September 13, 2017, amendment No. 187 printed in House Report 115–297 offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115–297 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 192 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 195 by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas.

Amendment No. 196 by Ms. NORTON of the District of Columbia.

Amendment No. 199 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 200 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 201 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 204 by Mr. MITCHELL of Michigan.

Amendment No. 207 by Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

Amendment No. 223 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 192 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 194, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]

AYES—214

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
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
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—194

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

NOT VOTING—25

Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Pelosi
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Tiberi
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1106

Mr. COFFMAN changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 195 OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 223, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

AYES—186

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—223

Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Barletta
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Rosen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Tiberi
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1109

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 196 OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 222, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]

AYES—186

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

NOES—222

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

Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—25

Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Tiberi
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1113

Mr. WELCH changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, I am unable to vote as I am in Florida assisting Floridians in the aftermath of Hurricane Irma.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

''Nay'' on rollcall No. 516 (MTR).

''Yea'' on rollcall No. 517 (H.R. 3697).

''Yea'' on rollcall No. 518 (Palmer amendment No. 192).

''Yea'' on rollcall No. 519 (Gohmert on behalf of Posey amendment No. 195).

''Nay'' on rollcall No. 520 (Norton amendment No. 196).

AMENDMENT NO. 199 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 226, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

AYES—183

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

NOES—226

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—24

Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Tiberi
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1117

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. POLIQUIN. Madam Chair, I inadvertently voted ''aye'' when I intended to vote ''no'' on rollcall No. 521.

AMENDMENT NO. 200 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 245, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

AYES—163

Adams
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—245

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kihuen
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rosen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
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
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—25

Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Tiberi
Vela
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1120

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PETERS. Madam Chair, on rollcall 522, I voted "aye" when I should have voted "no" on the Ellison amendment No. 200.

AMENDMENT NO. 201 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 221, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

AYES—186

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

NOES—221

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan

Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—26

Arrington
Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Schrader
Tiberi
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1124

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 204 OFFERED BY MR. MITCHELL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 241, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

AYES—166

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Love
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—241

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Barletta
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walker
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Marino
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Tiberi
Welch
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1128

Mr. PAULSEN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 207 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 195, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

AYES—211

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
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
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—195

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

NOT VOTING—27

Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Marino
Posey
Rice (SC)
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Schrader
Tiberi
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1131

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, I am unable to vote as I am in Florida assisting Floridians in the aftermath of Hurricane Irma.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Nay" on rollcall No. 521 (Ellison Amendment No. 199).

"Nay" on rollcall No. 522 (Ellison Amendment No. 200).

"Nay" on rollcall No. 523 (Ellison Amendment No. 201).

"Yea" on rollcall No. 524 (Mitchell Amendment No. 204).

"Yea" on rollcall No. 525 (Huizenga Amendment No. 207).

AMENDMENT NO. 223 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 265, noes 143, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

AYES—265

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Barletta
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rosen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IA)

NOES—143

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Babin
Banks (IN)
Barr
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Budd
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Estes (KS)
Ferguson
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
Meadows
Mitchell
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stivers
Taylor
Thornberry
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—25

Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Marino
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Tiberi
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1135

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 504, he reported the bill, as amended by House Resolution 500, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Jackson Lee moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3354 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 643, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $849,500,000)''.

Page 643, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $849,500,000)''.

Page 659, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $2,420,739,000)''.

Page 661, line 3, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $2,420,739,000)''.

Page 335, line 24 of Rules Committee Print 115-32, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $1,571,239,000)''.

Page 336, line 1 of Rules Committee Print 115-32, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $784,000,000)''.

Page 336, line 3 of Rules Committee Print 115-32, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $498,000,000)''.

Page 336, line 5 of Rules Committee Print 115-32, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $251,000,000)''.

Page 336, line 7 of Rules Committee Print 115-32, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $38,239,000)''.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this is a 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.

While this amendment will not kill the bill, it will save lives. It does this by transferring $2.4 billion to the FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation account, offset by eliminating the funding for the President's border wall and new funds for ICE to be used for an additional 10,000 detention beds.

Mitigation is preplanning. Mitigation is helping to mitigate the power outages all over the hurricane region. Mitigation is to minimize losses.

When we listen to the better angels of our nature, we know in our hearts that this is the right and just and American thing to do.

I along with my colleagues were eyewitnesses to the devastation inflicted on southeast Texas and Louisiana when struck on August 25, 2017, by Hurricane Harvey.

Our colleagues from Florida and the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico and those neighbors in the Caribbean are bearing similar witness to the terrible destruction caused earlier this week by Hurricane Irma.

Irma has taken the lives of at least 75 persons, to date, including 32 in Florida; 5 in the U.S. Virgin Islands, and may be counting upwards; 37 in the Caribbean; and, as well, 8 seniors who died, and the numbers may be going up because of those who are critical; and a family of 6 in the State of Texas. 200,000 Floridians were housed in shelters as of Monday, and 7.2 million homes and businesses are still without power.

Our hearts and prayers are with the victims of Hurricane Irma, and all Americans stand in solidarity with them and pledge to assist them in the long and hard work of recovery and reconstruction.

Hurricane Harvey is a heartbreaking but, also, a heartwarming story of horror and heroism. The epic storm dropped 21 trillion gallons of rainfall on Texas and Louisiana, most of it on the Houston metroplex. To put this in perspective, that is enough water to fill more than 24,000 Astrodomes or supply water to the power of the raging Niagara Falls for 15 days.

More than 49,000 homes suffered flood damage. More than 1,000 homes were completely destroyed in the storm.

But in the response to Hurricane Harvey, the world also saw the large and small acts of courage and kindness that Americans are known for, by our volunteers, our military, our Texas National Guard, and many others.

More than 13,000 people were rescued in the Houston area by the U.S. Coast Guard and the local first responders, police, fire, and civilian volunteers risking danger to help their friends and neighbors and persons they did not even know.

One of those who gave his life in service to others was Sergeant Steve Perez, who was funeralized yesterday, a 34-year veteran of the Houston Police Department. He left his home that morning and said: I have got to go to work. There are things that have to be done.

And then there was the DREAMer, Alonso Guillen, who came to Texas from Mexico as a teenager, who died

when his boat capsized while he was rescuing survivors of the flooding. He was funeralized just a few days ago.

That is who Texans are, and this is what Americans do.

To date, Harvey has claimed the lives of more than 60 persons, including, as I said, 6 members of the Saldivar family, who perished in Greens Bayou while trying to evacuate their flooded home and community.

Madam Speaker, Hurricane Harvey was one of the worst, but not the first, of natural disasters to befall our country; and, as Hurricane Irma demonstrated, it is not the last. That is why we need to pass this amendment, so that FEMA has the resources to assist States ahead of time, U.S. territories, federally recognized Tribes, and local communities in implementing sustained pre-disaster natural hazard mitigation programs.

Pre-disaster mitigation funds help reduce overall risk to people and structures from future disasters, raise public awareness, and reduce future losses before disaster strikes. I might also mention, it may deal with the issue of power loss ahead of time.

Mitigation planning is key to breaking the cycle of disaster damage reconstruction and repeated damage. We needed it. We need more of it.

Madam Speaker, we do not need another 10,000 beds in ICE detention centers, but we do need more than 10,000 beds in evacuation shelters.

We do not need to spend millions detaining law-abiding families. We do need to invest in sheltering disaster victims.

This amendment will ensure we spend less on raids and roundups and more on rescues.

Madam Speaker, we certainly do not need to spend $1.6 billion on a wall to stem the hoard of bad hombres streaming across our southern border that exists only in the imagination or paranoia. Those numbers are down. Know the real immediate threat to the security of our homeland.

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.

While this amendment will not kill the bill, it will save lives.

It does this by transferring $2.4 billion to the FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation account, offset by eliminating the funding for the President's border wall and new funds for ICE to be used for an additional 10,000 detention beds.

When we listen to the better angels of our nature, we know in our hearts this is the right and just—and the American—thing to do.

I was an eyewitness to the devastation inflicted on Southeast Texas and Louisiana when struck on August 25, 2017 by Hurricane Harvey.

Our colleagues from the great State of Florida and the U.S. Virgin Islands are bearing similar witness to the terrible destruction caused earlier this week by Hurricane Irma.

Hurricane Irma has taken the lives of at least 75 persons to date, including 32 in Florida, 5 in the U.S. Virgin Islands, and 37 in the Caribbean island nations of Barbuda, St. Maarten, Antigua, St. Kitts and Nevis.

200,000 Floridians were housed in shelters as of Monday and 7.2 million homes and businesses are still without power.

Our hearts and prayers are with the victims of Hurricane Irma and all Americans stand in solidarity with them and pledge to assist them in the long and hard work of recovery and reconstruction.

Hurricane Harvey is a heart-breaking but also heartwarming story of horror and heroism.

This epic storm dropped 21 trillion gallons of rainfall on Texas and Louisiana, most of it on the Houston Metroplex.

To put this in perspective, that is enough water to fill more than 24,000 Astrodomes or supply water to power the raging Niagara Falls for 15 days.

More than 49,000 homes suffered flood damage and more than 1,000 homes were completely destroyed in the storm.

But in the response to Hurricane Harvey the world also saw the large and small acts of courage and kindness that Americans are known for.

More than 13,000 people were rescued in the Houston area by the U.S. Coast Guard, state and local first responders, and civilian volunteers risking danger to help their friends, neighbors, and persons they did not even know.

One of those heroes was a Dreamer, Alonso Guillen, who came to Texas from Mexico as a teenager, and who died when his boat capsized while he was rescuing survivors of the flooding.

Another who gave his life in service to others was Sergeant Steve Perez, a 34-year veteran of the Houston Police Department, who insisted on reporting for duty early despite his beloved wife's pleas that he stay home given the dangerous conditions outside.

That is who Texans are and this is what Americans do.

To date Hurricane Harvey has claimed the lives of more than 60 persons, including six members of the Saldivar family who perished in Greens Bayou while trying to evacuate their flooded home and community.

Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Harvey was one of the worst, but not the first, natural disasters to befall our country, and as Hurricane Irma demonstrates, it is not the last.

And that is why we need to pass this amendment so that FEMA has the resources needed to assist States, U.S. Territories, Federally-recognized tribes, and local communities in implementing sustained pre-disaster natural hazard mitigation programs.

Pre-Disaster Mitigation funds help reduce overall risk to people and structures from future disasters and raise public awareness about reducing future losses before disaster strikes.

Mitigation planning is key to breaking the cycle of disaster damage, reconstruction, and repeated damage.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need another 10,000 beds in ICE detention centers; but we do need more than 10,000 beds in evacuation shelters.

We do not need to spend millions detaining law-abiding families; we do need to invest in sheltering disaster victims.

This amendment will ensure we spend less on raids and roundups and more on rescues.

And Mr. Speaker, we certainly do not need to spend $1.6 billion on a wall to stem the horde of bad hombres streaming across our southern border that exists only in imagination or paranoia.

No, the real and immediate threat to the security of our homeland is the destructive power of the apocalyptic invading armies of wind and water, appearing in the form of hurricanes and floods.

We do not need to waste money building a wall to prevent river crossings on the southern border.

We do need more pre-Disaster funding to help people get across the rivers running through the streets of our cities and towns when hurricanes strike unleashing floods.

Mr. Speaker, the choice now before the House is whether we should have more beds in detention centers or more beds in evacuation shelters.

Instead of the closed and angry fist of walls, roundups, and detention, we should choose instead to extend an open and loving hand to help the hopeless, homeless, and helpless.

In doing so, we reveal the true character of our nation and earn the blessings of our Creator.

I urge all Members to support this motion to recommit.

I ask for support of the Jackson Lee amendment to provide for the safety and security of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, the appropriations package before us this morning puts the House on the right path to completing its annual appropriations work for the entire Federal Government—on time and on budget.

□ 1145

Our legislation fulfills our constitutional duty to fund the government responsibly, to ensure that vital needs are met, to protect our Nation from harm within and outside our borders, and to govern in a way that will not only get things accomplished in Washington but that truly represents the people we serve. Our package is fiscally responsible.

We brought all 12 appropriations bills through the committee process in record time and gave every Member the opportunity to make their mark on the bills in the earliest stages. Over the past week, we have debated and voted on hundreds of amendments in a very open process that, again, allowed every Member's voice to be heard.

The results are bills that represent our shared values and priorities. I am proud we have brought forth an appropriations package that makes sure Americans have access to Federal services they rely on, encourages our economy to grow and thrive, and keeps our country safe.

I would like to take a moment to thank the incredible 12 chairs; the 12 ranking members; all members of the Appropriations Committee, the front office staff, both minority and majority, and particularly thank the clerks and the appropriations staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work and dedication.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to recommit and vote ''yes'' on the Make America Secure and Prosperous Act, and 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 noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 3284.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 223, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—186

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

NOES—223

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—24

Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Tiberi
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1152

Mr. DOGGETT changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

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.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 198, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

YEAS—211

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—198

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rokita
Rosen
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Rutherford
Scalise
Tiberi
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1159

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. ROYBALL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall 528. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall No. 528.

JOINT COUNTERTERRORISM AWARENESS WORKSHOP SERIES ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3284) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 4, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—398

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rosen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—4

Amash
Davidson
Jones
Massie

NOT VOTING—31

Bost
Bridenstine
Carter (GA)
Cicilline
Cleaver
Clyburn
Costa
Crist
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Espaillat
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Himes
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Posey
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rutherford
Scalise
Stivers
Tiberi
Vela
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1205

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 517 (On Passage of H.R. 3697), 528 (On Passage of H.R. 3354), and 529 (On Passage of H.R. 3284) I did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all three votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on Thursday, September 14, 2017. I had intended to vote "yes" on rollcall vote 516, "no" on vote 517, "no" on vote 518, "no" on vote 519, "yes" on vote 520, "yes" on vote 521, "yes" on vote 522, "yes" on vote 523, "no" on vote 524, "no" on vote 525, "yes" on vote 526, "yes" on vote 527, "no" on vote 528, and "yes" on vote 529.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to vote as I am in Florida assisting Floridians in the aftermath of Hurricane Irma.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yea" on rollcall No. 526 (Jackson Lee Amendment No. 223).

"Nay" on rollcall No. 527 (MTR).

"Yea" on rollcall No. 528 (H.R. 3354).

"Yea" on rollcall No. 529 (H.R. 3284).

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. BRADY of Texas, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 115–309) on the resolution (H. Res. 479) of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Treasury to provide to the House of Representatives the tax return information of President Donald J. Trump as well as the tax returns of each business entity disclosed by Donald J. Trump on his Office of Government Ethics Form 278e, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOMENT OF SILENCE ON 1-MONTH ANNIVERSARY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE TRAGEDY

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am joined by my colleagues from Virginia.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday marked the 1-month anniversary since we lost three Virginians in Charlottesville.

Today, my colleagues and I stand here to observe a moment of silence in honor of Heather Heyer of Charlottesville, Virginia; Lieutenant H. Jay Cullen of Midlothian, Virginia; and Trooper-Pilot Berke M.M. Bates of Quinton, Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House now observe a moment of silence.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2017, TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2017

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next and that the order of the House of January 3, 2017, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

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

There was no objection.

WE MUST NAME OUR ENEMY

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, 16 years ago today, atop a pile of rubble that just 3 days before stood tall as the World Trade Center, President Bush proclaimed to a hurting Nation: ''I can hear you, the rest of the world hears you.''

With bullhorn in hand and arm wrapped around a firefighter, he added: ''And the people who knocked these buildings down will hear all of us soon.''

That same day, Congress passed an Authorization for Use of Military Force to combat international terrorism. Today, that fight still continues, yet the international community has refused to define terrorism. How are we, and other nations, to fight a war against something that we cannot even define?

Today, I am introducing the Define it to Fight it Act, a bill that withholds 10 percent of our contributions to the United Nations until they are willing to define national terrorism, the very thing that they are supposed to be fighting.

To fulfill President Bush's promise, we must name our enemy and then make sure they hear us loud and clear, not just for our lifetime, but for generations to come.

HONORING CORPORAL FRANK LOUIS GARGUIOLO

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, with POW/MIA Recognition Day on September 15, I rise to honor Corporal Frank Louis Garguiolo, a veteran of, and prisoner of war during, the Second World War. He embodies the best of the Greatest Generation.

The son of immigrants, Frank was born in 1923, the youngest of seven siblings. He grew up in Cheektowaga and attended Buffalo schools. Tragedy struck young, and Frank's father passed away when he was just 12. Frank then went to work to support his mother and family.

At 19, Frank enlisted in the United States Army, serving with the 3rd Infantry Division. His tour saw him through many major battles in North Africa and Europe. Corporal Garguiolo was captured by Axis forces and subjected to brutal forced labor for over half a year. Eventually, he was rescued by his brothers in arms from the 3rd Infantry Division.

Today, at age 94, Frank is a fixture in his community and happily lives in the same house his father built.

Mr. Speaker, we must do everything we can to bring our heroes home so they can live out their lives like Corporal Garguiolo has.

KEYS RECOVERY

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I left Washington last week to be with my family and community as Hurricane Irma headed straight toward south Florida.

Some in the lower and middle Keys lost everything to the storm's 130-mile-per-hour winds and 10-foot storm surge. Some lost their lives. But with the Keys' tourism-based economy currently at a standstill, perhaps the greatest devastation will be the financial strain on individuals, families, and small entrepreneurs.

But there is hope. Conchs are resilient and generous people. It will be a long road, but coordinated local, State, and Federal resources have ensured the Keys recovery is already underway.

I have returned to Washington briefly to urge my colleagues to support two critical needs here in Congress: long-term, robust funding of FEMA, and a tax relief package for those trying to rebuild and recover after disasters like Hurricanes Irma and Harvey.

Mr. Speaker, this can happen to any district or community. Whether it is a hurricane, wildfire, or earthquake, we have a responsibility to come together when large groups of Americans are in desperate need. I look forward to working with my colleagues to do just that.

DISABILITY RIGHTS

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 620, the ADA Education and Reform Act, which recently passed out of the Judiciary Committee.

For 27 years, the Americans with Disabilities Act has made a difference in millions of lives, including my own, by prohibiting discrimination on the basis of a disability and requiring accessibility in places of public accommodation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 620 decimates the underlying intent of the ADA by allowing entities to wait before addressing barriers to access. It would roll back years of progress, and it sends a message to the disability community that we are not worthy of being included like everyone else. I urge my colleagues to consider the true implications of this policy.

Mr. Speaker, I was injured in 1980, a full 10 years before the ADA was enacted. I remember what our country was like before the ADA. I do not wish to go back. Instead of weakening our civil rights, let us work together to protect them.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATING ACCUWEATHER ON ITS 55TH ANNIVERSARY

(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 congratulate AccuWeather as it celebrates 55 years of serving communities, businesses, and institutions around the world.

In 1962, Dr. Joel Myers founded AccuWeather to help people plan their lives, protect their businesses, and to make the most of their days.

Dr. Myers has led an impressive career as a fellow of the National Meteorological Society and one of the top entrepreneurs in American history. Today, AccuWeather is the world's largest weather and digital media company, reaching nearly 2 billion people at least 29 million times each day. Proudly, it is headquartered right in State College, Pennsylvania.

Throughout the years, the company has expanded its offices to New York, Montreal, and Tokyo, just to name a few, but it has always called Pennsylvania home, and it has been a major employer for decades in the Commonwealth.

Over 55 years, AccuWeather continues to build upon its main mission: to improve people's lives.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate AccuWeather on 55 years of service, accuracy, trust, and protection they have offered to people around the world.

RAISING AWARENESS FOR CENTRAL COAST VETERANS CEMETERY

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a group of veterans from the 20th Congressional District in California: Rick ''Phin'' Phinney, Steve ''Pops'' Culver, and Hy ''Crash'' Libby, the three ''black sheep'' from the American Legion Post 31, who are about to complete an epic motorcycle ride across our country to raise awareness and financial support for the Central Coast Veterans Cemetery.

Two weeks ago, I met and sent off the three riders and their crew at the Central Coast Veterans Cemetery, and tomorrow, all of them will arrive at the Arlington National Cemetery. Throughout that epic ride, they have been carrying a large American flag, and once they get here, that flag will be flown over the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

The veterans will then return that flag to Central Coast Veterans Cemetery where it will be proudly flown over that hallowed ground.

Having driven 10,000 miles through 21 States, the three black sheep will truly have an epic ride. From our community's veteran cemetery there on the central Coast to our Nation's veterans' cemetery here in our Capital, this journey will not only support the Central Coast Veterans Cemetery, it will serve as another demonstration of what our veterans do best: serve those who serve our Nation. And for that, I not only recognize Phin, Pops, and Crash, I honor them and I thank them, once again, for their service.

PULMONARY FIBROSIS AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to September being National Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Month and the bipartisan resolution that I and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) have introduced.

Pulmonary fibrosis is an incurable lung disease that impacts 200,000 Americans, and for whose who aren't familiar with it, you may be surprised to learn that the mortality rate for those with pulmonary fibrosis is as high as those with breast cancer. It kills one American every 13 minutes—40,000 Americans die each and every year. There is no known cure, and there is no known reliable treatment to relieve its symptoms nor prolong the life of its victims.

Eighty percent of those who contract pulmonary fibrosis do not live more than 5 years after receiving that diagnosis, and the median survival rate is just half that time.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue my efforts in working with the National Institutes of Health as well as patient advocacy groups to find a cure for this deadly disease.

UNITED UNDER THE DREAM ACT

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, too often we hear about our country being divided, and yet when it comes to the Dream Act, the message is clear: our country is united.

A wide majority of Americans and nearly 70 percent of Republicans want us to pass this legislation. They want us to provide permanent legal status to DREAMers—800,000 people who are working hard, studying in our universities, contributing to our economy, and serving in our military.

Mr. Speaker, I demand that we bring up the Dream Act for a vote. We cannot force these young people, who have received DACA, to wait any longer to know that America wants them to live here.

THANKING ALL WHO RESPONDED TO HELP AFTER HURRICANE IRMA

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, this week, Hurricane Irma brought devastation to south Florida and many parts of the Southeastern United States, including the 12th District of Georgia.

In times of disaster, Americans come together and show their love and support for one another, and I thank all of our first responders, law enforcement, our military, and Good Samaritans for their extraordinary service in this time of need. Your selflessness saved countless lives in this unprecedented storm.

I thank Governor Deal, President Trump, and FEMA, and all 19 counties in the 12th District of Georgia that were included in the Federal emergency declaration authorizing FEMA to provide direct Federal resources to our district.

Visit disasterassistance.gov to learn about the options available to you. It is the greatest honor of my life to represent the people of Georgia's 12th Congressional District, and my office is here to help in any way we can. If you need any help in the aftermath of Hurricane Irma, please do not hesitate to reach out. America is resilient.

The American people are resilient when we come together as one, and now we must assess the damage and help each other rebuild our communities.

PROTECTING DREAMERS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, DREAMers are bright, hardworking people who simply want to live in peace and contribute to the only country they know as home. They worship in our churches, serve as teachers and nurses in our schools and hospitals, and some even defend our country in the military.

Additionally, every DACA recipient passed extensive background checks

and came forward to register with the Federal Government. There is no security reason that DREAMers should not stay and continue contributing to our community and our local economies. There is no way to disguise that their deportation would just be the worst of what our country is all about. We have to protect them.

Being Members of Congress, it is so important that we step up, that we answer the call, and that we offer these young people the opportunity to continue to stay in our country, continue to work, go to school, and contribute so much because they have already given our country so much.

I urge my Republican colleagues to work with House Democrats to immediately pass the Dream Act. It is the only way we can provide peace of mind to nearly 150,000 DACA recipients in my home State of Texas.

CONGRATULATING MISS NORTH DAKOTA CARA MUND

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Miss North Dakota Cara Mund, who was crowned Miss America last Sunday.

A native of Bismarck, Cara made history in our State when she became the first North Dakotan to be crowned Miss America. Throughout the competition, Cara shared her desire to make her home State proud, and boy did she do that, encouraging others to follow their dreams, saying: '' . . . it doesn't matter where you come from geographically.''

When asked what she hoped to gain from her year as Miss America, Cara said she is focused on what she can do for others. Cara has been giving back for years, having raised more than $78,000 for the Make-A-Wish Foundation through her Passion for Fashion Show that she founded when she was just 14 years old.

As she travels the United States, I know she will inspire and impress everyone she comes in contact with. This former Capitol Hill intern plans to attend law school, become the first woman Governor of North Dakota, and perhaps even represent her State in Congress one day. I hope she waits a while. But anyway, Kris and I join all North Dakotans in congratulating our new Miss America.

We are proud of you, Cara, and we look forward to hearing the positive message you are going to be sharing throughout this Nation throughout the next year.

PROVIDING CRITICAL FINANCIAL AID

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of half a million students across the country who will lose access to critical financial aid without action by Congress.

Perkins loans are an important resource for low- and middle-income students. A majority of those receiving this aid come from families with household incomes less than $30,000 a year. In my district alone, this program is used by students at Clarkson, Paul Smith's College, and SUNY Potsdam, SUNY Canton, and SUNY Plattsburgh.

Without congressional action, these students will lose access to these important loans after September 30 when this program expires. I have introduced H.R. 2482, the Perkins Loan Program Extension Act, that will reauthorize this aid for two more years. I have been grateful to receive support from 160 bipartisan cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, we must ensure that low-income students have access to a quality education, and the Perkins Loan Program is a critical tool to help them succeed. I urge the House to swiftly pass my bill before the end of the month.

RESTORING THE RULE OF LAW IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's first duty is to protect its citizens. For too long, dangerous gangs like MS–13 have exploited our Nation's immigration laws and made our communities less safe. Hoosiers are tired of it, and it is well past time to crack down on this illegal activity and restore the rule of law in America.

Today, the House passed a commonsense reform that does just that, ensuring violent gangs are kept off our streets. The Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act would allow law enforcement to detain and deport criminal alien gang members who pose a serious threat to our safety.

Instead of waiting on another tragedy, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement could remove these criminals before they have a chance to harm innocent Americans.

The bill would also prevent these criminals from ever entering the United States again. It is really just common sense. This bill will make America safer, and it is worthy of our support.

CONGRATULATING JOHNSON CITY ON ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 125th anniversary of the village of Johnson City in Broome County. Founded in 1892, Johnson City was first named Lestershire. The village was later renamed Johnson City in honor of George F. Johnson, a factory worker who rose through the ranks at the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Company, a local manufacturing firm started in Binghamton in 1854.

Under Johnson's leadership, Endicott-Johnson evolved into an economic hub in the region. Through the square deal and his generosity to both the community and his employees, George Johnson played a pivotal role in shaping Johnson City into the village we know today.

Part of the Tri-Cities, Johnson City is now home to over 15,000 people and will soon be home to Binghamton University's School of Pharmacy.

On behalf of the entire 22nd District, I extend my sincerest congratulations to Johnson City on this landmark anniversary.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION MUST EXPLAIN IMPROPER USE OF FUNDS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, a recent Federal audit found that the Obama administration improperly used, via the Bureau of Reclamation, $84 million on California Governor Jerry Brown's pet project, the Delta tunnels. In planning, this is a project that would transfer water from northern California, where my district is, to southern California.

This comes after years of assurance that no tax dollars would be spent on the Governor's controversial legacy project, nor was there even an appropriation made by Congress to do so, and that is where the problem is. It is the illegal use of Federal dollars in the planning of this project.

Taxpayers ended up paying for a large portion of this project's planning costs without their knowledge and, again, without Congress' authorization, which is obviously unacceptable.

The Bureau of Reclamation needs to explain to Congress how and why this happened, and the employees and the appointees who carried it out must be held responsible.

More importantly, California needs to repay every penny to the Federal Government and the taxpayers of the other 49 States for this illegal use and improper use.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a small thing. Congress and the American people need to know what is happening with this and not be lied to.

□ 1230

TRIBUTE TO PAT HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 60

minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an activist, a crusader, an educator, a warrior in the fight for civil rights, and an American heroine, Ms. Patricia Hill.

For those who did not know Pat Hill, who passed away earlier this week, she was many things. She was an athlete, an educator, and a former Chicago police officer, just to name a few of her endeavors.

She was the eldest daughter of Lucille Fleming and Hercules Richardson. Pat Hill was an early track star. As a member of Chicago's Mayor Daley's Youth Foundation's track team, she was mentored by Olympians Willye White and Ira Murchison; and Pat missed making the 1968 U.S. Olympic Team by one-quarter of an inch.

Her athleticism and pioneering spirit extended beyond the track, Mr. Speaker. Pat Hill was also a trailblazer in women's professional basketball when she joined the Chicago Debs in the early 1970s.

After completing her college degree, Pat Hill shared her love and knowledge of sports by becoming a physical education teacher in the Chicago Public Schools. She held that position until she left to become a member of the Chicago Police Department, where she would rise to work with one of Chicago's other trailblazers as a bodyguard for the late Chicago mayor, Harold Washington.

Mr. Speaker, even before Pat Hill became a member of the Chicago Police Department, she had been inspired by the work of the Afro-American Patrolmen's League to uncover the truth behind the murder of my dear friend, Fred Hampton, in the late 1960s. After Pat became a member of the Chicago Police Department, she worked with the Afro-American Patrolmen's League to improve minority hiring and women's inclusion, and, ultimately, she rose as the executive director of the AAPL.

After Pat retired as a police officer, she served as a lecturer at the Northeastern Illinois University's Carruthers Center for Inner City Studies, where she would take classes to, among many places, Selma, Alabama, to ensure that the lessons and experiences of Bloody Sunday and others will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to summarize the life and accomplishments of an individual like Ms. Patricia Hill in a few short moments, but, suffice it to say, the city and the people of Chicago, and the people all across this Nation are forever dedicated to Pat Hill for the strides she made on behalf of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, my family and I are personally indebted to Ms. Patricia Hill for the decades-long friendship and love that she shared with my late wife, Carolyn, and my entire family.

Pat, while we are saddened by your departure and saddened that you are no longer with us in the Earth realm, we know that you have a better seat than all of us and that you are in a better place. We find comfort in the Bible, as written in the book of Matthew 5:4, that says: ''Blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted.''

Mr. Speaker, I rise today and honor Ms. Pat Hill—my friend, my family's friend, and a great American. We truly are comforted because we truly know that Pat Hill is blessed, and we are blessed also.

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

HURRICANE IRMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his inspiring words.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to update the House on what has occurred in Florida after the aftermath of Hurricane Irma.

First, I want to start by thanking so many Members of Congress for supporting a package that doubled from $7 billion to $15 billion, the emergency relief. Not only was it so critical for the great State of Texas, but it was absolutely essential for anticipating the effects that Irma would have on the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Florida, Georgia, up through South Carolina, and southeast United States.

When I arrived back on Friday—you know how important it is to go back to your district when there is a crisis on hand—I saw people taking the notice of evacuation seriously. I saw people stocking up on gas, stocking up on water, stocking up their cupboards, making sure to be ready.

While it was initially supposed to hit the southeastern portion of Florida, as you know, these predictions can be somewhat accurate, which is why we always need to be sure to always prepare, whether you think you are in the eye of the storm or not. Because, in fact, after it went through the central Keys and leveled a lot of Marathon and other central Keys islands, it hit southwest Florida. The eye went right through the Naples-Fort Myers area, and a lot of those folks are still struggling with that. It actually went up through the western center of the State, through the western portion of my district in Polk County, as well as Hillsborough County, Pasco County, and other areas, and then finally going up through the Big Bend.

That night, the wind was so loud and the rain was so hard that you couldn't even hear the trees snapping. When I woke up the next day, I knew it was bad, but, to my surprise, there were trees down everywhere.

Right outside our door, right down the street, in Osceola, Orange, and Polk Counties—all the counties that I represent—one of the first initial acts of courage that I saw was neighborhood folks with nice F–150s, chainsaws, and all of this construction equipment, volunteering their time to get these major trees out of the roads. We saw that throughout Kissimmee, east Orlando, Winter Haven, Haines City, Lake Wales, and so many areas, like St. Cloud, that I represent.

That debris removal that the State was approved for by FEMA is going to make sure, now that those trees are on the sidewalk or they are on the median, that they are going to get picked up. It is going to be so critical that we have that either 75 or 90 percent reimbursement for debris removal to make sure that these neighborhoods can come back to normal.

One of the other impacts of having all of these trees down, since we haven't had a hurricane with major winds since 2004, was that it absolutely decimated the power grid. If our fellow Members remember nothing else about what I have to say here today, it is that our power grid was absolutely annihilated—the worst that Duke Energy, FP&L, and municipal electricity providers like KUA and OUC said they have seen in their history.

There are people that are without power now—several hundred thousand—and it is primarily because we saw so many of these trees go down on power lines.

When I went through my district, I saw rivers swell to floods. We saw worse in Harvey—far worse flooding in Harvey. We know with the supplemental FEMA packages that we are going to have to take care of Texas and Louisiana. But there are areas that are still under water as of yesterday, as of last night, and as of this morning. A few of them in east Orlando, where the Econlockhatchee River swelled over into the swamps and over into apartment buildings.

There were still, unfortunately, some UCF students that needed to evacuate; and I think, after the firefighters got there with the fire trucks, they heeded that warning.

I saw in Kissimmee flooding in the Mill Slough area. The slough flooded over. And we saw in Buenaventura Lakes flooding in the streets in many neighborhoods.

I witnessed folks throughout the area in mobile homes suffer pretty extreme damage in certain areas of Polk County.

I commend FEMA for allowing these counties and many others on the central and southern part of the State to get the designation of individual assistance. These folks are still without power—many of them worried about the dangers that are still going on. So to know that the Federal Government—Congress—has their back is absolutely a hope that they can hang on to as they sit day after day without

power, slowly but surely getting back on their feet.

I will be having outreach events throughout the district. Some of my fellow peers who went through Harvey have suggested that it is critical to have these, not only major FEMA centers, but ones that are embedded in the various neighborhoods, because some people have trouble getting gas and transporting around, and have trouble through mass transit getting to some of these major centers.

□ 1245

So we will be following the cue of others, our brothers and sisters in Houston, by having localized FEMA outreach centers in the district, and I look forward to hosting some of those this week.

Throughout the State, we see the Federal and State government working hand in hand with our local governments.

It is key that we are going to need a supplemental package for Texas, parts of Louisiana, Florida, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and parts of Georgia and South Carolina. I know that Congress, like last Friday, will hopefully come together to pass that package.

One of the things that we are going to need to do going forward is continue encouraging local governments and utilities to harden their infrastructure. We in the Federal Government should be promoting and matching funds with those utilities that are going to put their power lines underground. The cost of keeping them up aboveground is going to continue to exacerbate these disasters.

Just understanding by the numbers, we had one of the largest evacuations in the Nation's history. Nearly 7 million people were asked to evacuate from central and southeastern Florida to shelters or other facilities. As of Monday morning, over 200,000 Floridians were still in shelters.

Nearly 33.8 million Floridians lost power to their homes and businesses, with hundreds of thousands still without power.

We saw a massive hit to our citrus crop, which is already struggling with citrus greening, and we have bipartisan letters going out from Congressman ROSS, Congressman ROONEY, myself, and others making sure that the USDA follows along with FEMA to make sure that our citrus growers can have some relief as they grapple with what will be a dismal 2017–2018 crop.

We saw Florida's coasts, especially in cities like Jacksonville, experience historic flooding. The Atlantic came into the St. Johns. The St. Johns, being one of those rivers that flows north, took much of the water from central Florida and brought it forward to create a terrible situation of flooding of 2 to 3 feet in downtown Jacksonville alone.

For the first time in U.S. history, we saw two Category 4 hurricanes make landfall in the same year. Obviously, we need to continue to prepare for the increasing weather events caused by man-made climate change, and that will be why, whether you agree or not with the cause of it, that we will need to harden our facilities, our infrastructure, our buildings, and our utilities. Whether or not you agree with what the cause of it is, we know that the solutions are making sure to have more resilient infrastructure, building up our coasts, and making sure that we have, through the Federal Government, incentives for our local and State governments to do that.

Officials have reported 31 dead across three States in connection with this hurricane, 24 of those in Florida.

One other area that Congress needs to look at is generators for our nursing homes. This is already required under Florida law, yet we saw several people yesterday, eight of them, pass, our seniors in their golden years, who should be protected.

And when you are talking about no power in Florida, you are talking about not only no ability to turn on the lights, but air-conditioning, which is critical when it is 90-plus degrees out, particularly for our seniors, our children, and our persons with disabilities.

I want to thank all of our first responders: our firefighters; our cops; our EMTs; all the county officials and city officials who put together all this demanding information to get the FEMA Individual Assistance designation; our local officials for continuing, to this moment, to give us information on hardest hit areas; and also our community for coming together, our volunteers, those who are helping get the trees out of the streets, for providing water and food to hardest hit areas, to people opening up their homes, contributing through nonprofits such as the Red Cross. All these issues, all these commitments, all this volunteerism is coming together to help out our constituents.

I am appreciative, Mr. Speaker, for this time to be able to brief Congress on some of the issues affecting central Florida, and I thank my peers for their help and for their continued efforts in Texas, in Florida, in Puerto Rico, in the Virgin Islands, and in South Carolina and Georgia, where we saw a lot of this damage happening.

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

SANCTIONS AGAINST NORTH KOREA

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

Mr. HILL. I thank the Chair for recognizing me for this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, this week in Congress, we have considered in the House Financial Services Committee legislation that will increase and expand the sanctions against the government and the dictators in North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the north Asian region and our allies there are of critical importance to the United States economically. South Korea and Japan are major economic partners of the United States. Both countries represent a major partnership in our security interests in north Asia, and so it is fitting that we continue to work in Congress, along with the Trump administration, to increase the financial sanctions and economic sanctions on the rogue government in North Korea.

For our citizens, it is important to trace back the history of U.S. sanctions and the relationship with North Korea. Going back four Presidents—Trump, Obama, Bush 43, and Clinton—we have been dealing with North Korea.

President Clinton agreed to a ''freeze'' and ''dismantlement'' of the North Korean nuclear program, Mr. Speaker; and as a result, the North Koreans agreed to inspections, and the United States, along with its allies, agreed to $4 billion in payments to the regime. That was in 1994, Mr. Speaker. We don't have much to show for that effort.

In January, in the State of the Union, 2002, President Bush 43 described North Korea as part of the axis of evil, including Iraq and Iran. Clearly, the North Koreans were not complying with Mr. Clinton's agreement, but the post-9/11 world of the United States had our government, our diplomacy, our military, our sanctions regime focused on the Middle East, focused on Afghanistan, Iraq, and, indeed, Iran.

And then you come to the period of President Obama, where his strategy with North Korea was one of strategic patience. We have had 8 years, Mr. Speaker, of strategic patience, and what have we got to show for that? Unprecedented numbers of ballistic missile flights, unprecedented numbers of nuclear tests.

So, Mr. Speaker, after over two decades, it was time for a change.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take the floor of the House today and thank the leadership of President Trump and his very capable national security team, led by Secretary Mattis, Secretary Tillerson, for ending strategic patience and for taking our country and the world in a different direction to end the nuclear ambitions of North Korea.

Now, the United States, on a bipartisan basis in this House and in the upper Chamber, in the Senate, along with the Trump administration, is fully onboard with using all the tools that we have to once and for all lead to denuclearization of the peninsula and end North Korea's rogue program to join the group of nuclear nations. They have taken themselves out of nuclear nonproliferation. They are a rogue nation.

I am very pleased to see Secretary Mnuchin at the Treasury focus on what

new financial sanctions under current law the United States can pursue by our Treasury Department.

I am very pleased with Chairman ROYCE of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Ranking Member ENGEL, and the Financial Services Committee for their collaboration on legislation on how we enhance sanctions that the United States can place on people doing business with North Korea and North Korea itself.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate our Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador Haley, for not one, but two 15–0 votes in the U.N. Security Council on ratcheting up the pressure on sanctions. Those are important.

But the most important thing is, Mr. Speaker, whether it is secondary sanctions and sanctions in the United States put on others by the U.S. alone or multilateral sanctions imposed by the U.N. Security Council, the secret is enforcement. We must have enforcement.

When you look back over this two-decade period, you can't really come to the conclusion that we have ever seriously sanctioned the rogue government in North Korea, not to the extent that we have done with Iran, not to the extent that we did with Iraq, the two other partners in President Bush's axis of evil.

So the time is now, Mr. Speaker, to use all of our skills and abilities: diplomatically, as led by Secretary Tillerson; economically, as led by Secretary Mnuchin and our worthy, great leader, our Ambassador at the United Nations; and in military strategy with our allies, under Secretary Mattis. We have the support of the world now, Mr. Speaker, and this is no time to not bear down and get that kind of enforcement.

I was so delighted on behalf of the Congress and on behalf of the United States that, just yesterday, Prime Minister Modi in India and Prime Minister Abe, on a visit to India, reiterated their strong support for enforcement of the United Nations sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank this administration for taking a new look and taking North Korea's ambitions seriously and taking the issue of using all of our absolute capabilities, whether they are diplomatic, economic, or military, to end this rogue nation's nuclear ambitions.

GIRL SCOUTS STEM BADGES

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and come to the House floor to recognize the Girl Scouts of America, which recently announced that they are adding 23 new badges related to science, technology, engineering, math, and the outdoors. These new STEM badges come a month after Girl Scouts of the USA added cybersecurity badges to promote computer and internet literacy and cybersecurity. These new initiatives within the Girl Scouts were a reflection of its ability to adapt to the ever-changing skills essential to the development of our youth in this century.

As an Eagle Scout, I understand the importance of values and skills acquired through scouting, and I commend the Girl Scouts for encouraging our youth to explore these innovative scientific fields.

As a member of the Congressional Scouting Caucus, I will continue to support the good work of Girl Scouts of the USA, and I look forward to following its continued success for generations of young women to come.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF ADAM MCCLUNG

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of a man who had an indelible impact on Arkansas and our Nation, Mr. Adam McClung, who passed away last month at 37 years young.

Adam was a husband, a father, and a champion of the cattle industry in Arkansas while he served as the executive vice president of the Arkansas Cattlemen's Association.

A graduate of Greenbrier High School in the beautiful Second Congressional District, Adam attended Oklahoma State University, where he studied agriculture, business economics, and animal science.

In 2014, Adam was recognized by the White House and the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a ''Champion of Change.'' He was one of only 15 individuals from around our country to be recognized as a leader in his industry that year.

Adam's passion and drive will be missed throughout Arkansas and the cattle industry.

He is survived by his wife, Chantel, and a daughter, Maggie Blair.

I extend my respect, affection, and prayers for the family and his loved ones.

□ 1300

REMEMBERING MELVIN PICKENS, THE ''BROOM MAN'' OF LITTLE ROCK

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and remember the unrelenting, optimistic world view of Melvin Pickens, a constituent affectionately known around Little Rock as the ''Broom Man.'' Mr. Pickens passed away at age 84 in June, after battling numerous health issues.

The Broom Man earned his nickname over a 60-year tenure purchasing iconic, red-handled brooms at wholesale and selling them to passersby for $10.

I remember Melvin fondly at my many breakfasts at the Ozark Smokehouse Restaurant in Little Rock, and including my past broom purchases.

Through a never-ending battle with legal blindness, and an unexpected stroke, which made carrying brooms over his shoulder incredibly difficult, Melvin never ceased to retain a positive, hopeful attitude. His hard work, determination, and unyielding perseverance, and never quitting, enabled him to provide his late wife and four children a wonderful life. And all four of those children attended college.

The Broom Man is an everlasting testament to the value of having a rigorous work ethic, an optimistic world view, and being genuinely a caring person.

RECOGNIZING ARKANSAS NATIONAL GUARD STAFF SERGEANT TASHEENIA WALLACE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Arkansas National Guard Staff Sergeant Tasheenia Wallace for becoming the first woman to ever complete the Arkansas National Guard Infantry Course.

On July 26, Staff Sergeant Wallace graduated from the Infantry Transition Course, a 2-week residency training program at the Robinson Maneuver Training Center in North Little Rock. She was 1 of 22 people to complete the program, which allows soldiers who are already serving to change their current military occupational specialty to infantry.

Staff Sergeant Wallace now holds four different occupational specialties: administration, logistics, chemicals, and now hard-earned infantry. With this training, she is able to command a squad, usually composed of 7 to 10 soldiers.

My congratulations and best wishes to Staff Sergeant Wallace and her bright future defending our Nation.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to be here on the House floor.

We passed appropriations bills. It is a rare thing to hear it coming from me, but the Appropriations Committee for the Republican majority here in the House of Representatives has actually done an extraordinary job this year. It hasn't been easy. They have spent a tremendous amount of hours taking votes, during which it was made particularly partisan.

It is just a shame when people will take votes just along party lines and not even reach out in the areas where there is mutual interest. But, as with any bill, there are things that could have been better. But our appropriators took some tough votes, and some of them tough politically, but, overall, they did a remarkable job and they are to be commended for the work they did.

We actually got our 12 appropriations bills passed in the House. I look forward to the day—it may be years away, months away, weeks away, days away—when the Senate is capable of passing 12 appropriations bills.

It is very important, too, that we note the agreement that President Trump reached. Widely reported, the President made a deal with NANCY PELOSI and CHUCK SCHUMER. But whether it is one of the worst votes I have taken or not, I knew, number

one—Texas had been going through Hurricane Harvey, but Texas had planned for the future. And God bless the Texas Legislature. Governor Greg Abbott has been a dear friend since we started as district judges together back in January of 1993. And I think the world of Governor Greg Abbott. He is doing a superb job through the emergency situation that Hurricane Harvey has created in Texas.

Also, Lieutenant Governor Dan Patrick is a very good friend. I think the world of him. He has done a remarkable job leading there in Texas from the standpoint of being the head of the Senate. He's a very conservative man of principle. It is just a pleasure to have such able, competent, not just conservatives, but very smart people who are people of principle.

They created a rainy day fund. It has billions of dollars in it. Obviously, Harvey was definitely a rainy day.

But when we took this vote on getting money into the emergency, the FEMA, our emergency system, we were assured by people that I believed to be very honest that they really were out of money for FEMA. That vote had to be taken to get money into our emergency system so they could help Florida prepare as Hurricane Irma approached.

Like I said, Texas had prepared for a rainy day as far beyond the extent of their preparation. But I knew we could haggle over emergency funding, we could haggle over the debt ceiling, we could haggle over a CR coming up, and Texas would be okay while we were debating for 2, 3, 4 weeks, whatever it took until we got agreement. But Florida did not have a rainy day fund. They needed help. Irma was approaching.

But the other thing that struck me about the need to get that vote done, give the President 90 days, was that we still have not changed the law to give Americans the help that so many tens or hundreds of millions needed. We have got over 300 million here in the country and, of course, there was bragging about the millions that got healthcare under ObamaCare.

Well, that is a misnomer. It is a misstatement because the truth is that some people got health insurance, but there were millions of people that got—well, they lost the insurance. So all the statements about, ''If you like your insurance, you can keep it,'' those were lies. Those people making those statements have been now shown they knew they were lies at the time they were being made. The architect of ObamaCare knew that people would lose their insurance they liked; knew that they would lose doctors they liked.

The way ObamaCare was designed, it even gave huge incentives, financially, to the remaining big monopoly health insurance companies not to bring into their network hospitals like MD Anderson or Cleveland Clinic. There were actually incentives built in ObamaCare to have health insurance companies not put chronic care facilities like cancer and heart disease in their network because that meant people that had those conditions would get that insurance because they had things like MD Anderson or Cleveland Clinic or Mayo, whatever it was, in network, and they didn't want them because that would be costly.

So it was a very subtle way ObamaCare was designed in order to encourage insurance companies to actually avoid giving people the doctors they had had before, the facilities they had had before and, in many cases, life-saving and life-lengthening facilities.

So there are just so many people hurting. In August, as I went all over east Texas—from the very southeast end down in Sabine County to the very north end, up in northwest end, up in Wood County, to the northeast end, up in Harrison County, down to the southwest corner of my district, down below Diboll in Angelina County—people are hurting, and they are begging for Congress to keep its word.

We said: If you gave us the majority in the House and Senate, we would repeal ObamaCare.

And, by golly, the American public gave us the majority in the House and Senate. Yes, President Obama was in the White House, but we got the majority in the House and Senate. And, holy smoke, we were able to get—it wasn't a total repeal, but, under reconciliation procedures, we were able to repeal most of ObamaCare in the House and in the Senate, and send it to the President's desk, where he vetoed it. Well, that wasn't a big surprise.

So Republicans were saying: Okay. You give us the House, the Senate majority, and the White House, then it is a no-brainer because then we have a President who will sign the bill that we passed when Obama was President, and this time the Republican President will surely sign it.

Well, not only do we know we have a Republican in the White House, but President Trump—God bless him—made clear: If you just send me that bill that you passed in the last Congress that Obama vetoed, I will sign it, and then we can work on a healthcare system where people can get the care they need.

Now, what has not been talked about in the alt-left media—some people call them the mainstream media. But the alt-left, mainstream media, whatever you want to call them, they have talked about all the millions of people that now have health insurance.

No. Most of those—it may be a few, but most of them have got Medicaid. That is not the most desirable insurance you can have.

And another thing that needs to be made clear: health insurance is not healthcare. Anyone in America here legally, illegally, criminal, non criminal, it doesn't matter, if you are in the United States and you have a problem, you can go to the emergency room.

I have been in emergency rooms with my immediate family members, including kids, in-laws. I mean, I have been there. And we wait in line behind people that may have a cold or a cut or a minor this or that. They have got healthcare.

□ 1315

And most of those people aren't going to pay anything, and they got the healthcare they needed. Now, they don't have health insurance, apparently, most of them that I have been in line behind, because you could hear the discussion as they go through filling out the forms with the hospital people. It would be far better if we had a better system of clinics for people like that so they didn't have to go tie up the most expensive healthcare there is in the emergency room. They could go to a clinic and get the things they need.

I was yanking a hook out of a catfish that my youngest daughter had caught some years back, and it is kind of embarrassing, a Member of Congress, and the hook had not set until it was well down in the catfish, so I was having a lot of trouble getting it out. And I got a long needle-nose pliers and I was pulling it out, and I just strained as hard as I could and, lo and behold, pulled the hook out and embedded it very deeply in my hand down at the base of the thumb.

People started freaking out. It was no big deal. I mean, I just had a hook buried about three-quarters of an inch or so in my thumb.

I went down for an emergency. I didn't want to. Somebody said: Look, we will take care of your daughter. You need to get a tetanus shot. When I found out the line was going to be about 2 hours before they could get around to messing with the hook that was embedded in my thumb, well, I went home and ended up using ice, and I eventually got it out myself.

But I know, even without one of my kids or relatives, just by myself, I have been there. I have sat there. I have listened to conversations. There is no question, health insurance is not healthcare.

People are still hurting, and they relied on our promise; and if we don't get the big part of ObamaCare repealed, at least at a minimum, and get a system in place that gets people back toward the kind of healthcare they once knew and loved—if we weren't part of the government, as an old judge, I know those lawsuits would be brought.

The allegation in the pleadings would be that a promise was made which lured someone in to act to their detriment based on those promises. The doctrine, legally, is called promissory estoppel. The judge could issue an order, if you win the case, and prevent someone from going back on their word after they made a promise on which another party relied to their detriment.

Unfortunately for the American public, when it is Congress, or, in particular, the Senate, and in particular a Republican Senator, or more, who makes an absolute repeated promise

over and over that they are going to do something if you elect them or reelect them and people rely on that, they vote them in and it turns out it is to their detriment because that Senator was not being honest in running for office, well, it is kind of a shame that you can't get a judge to come in and say: ''I am issuing an order under the doctrine of promissory estoppel. You will not be allowed to back down off of your promise. You will make good on your promise.''

When it is the government, you can't sue them and force that, because promissory estoppel does not apply in a government situation, not normally.

So what are we left with? Well, people can say, well, you know, wait until the next election. We will have to replace people. No. This is it. This is the chance. This is a generational chance. We promised people certain things we would do, and I was fully supportive of the promises that President Donald J. Trump made that helped him get elected. Particularly, he promised to repeal and replace ObamaCare. For heaven's sake, we ought to be helping him in that.

I am very grateful. We had some difficult times there between some of us, particularly the House Freedom Caucus and the House leadership, but PAUL RYAN, KEVIN MCCARTHY, STEVE SCALISE, they came through. We worked together and we got an agreement that repealed most of ObamaCare, and we got it down to the Senate.

I have my friend from West Virginia, and I would be glad to yield to him.

EXPRESSING FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the football players of Clay and Braxton County High Schools, both in my congressional district, the Second District of beautiful West Virginia. I commend them for exercising their right to pray before a football game on September 1.

After one person complained about prayer at football games, Clay County High School decided to institute a moment of silence instead. Much to everyone's surprise, during that moment of silence, both teams ran onto the field, knelt, and prayed together. In a spontaneous action throughout the stands, individuals stood and joined the prayer.

In this time of great divisiveness in our Nation, gestures like these remind us about what is great in America. Our First Amendment protects all Americans from laws that hinder our religious freedom, our right to free speech, and our right to worship God as we see fit.

Even though Braxton and Clay County are bitter rivals in football, they came together to share this moment to worship the Almighty God. I commend them for this gesture.

For the record, Braxton County won the game 23–13.

To the gentleman from Texas, thank you. I appreciate your good work here and your words for the American people.

Mr. GOHMERT. I have been to my friend's home, beautiful as it is in a beautiful part of the country, and I appreciate the gentleman's recognition. It sounds like it is well deserved.

Regarding what has to be done about healthcare, clearly, the Senate is not going to get to 60 votes on anything to do with repealing, replacing ObamaCare. We have this reconciliation procedure that we went through all the hoops, dotted the I's, crossed the T's, and we passed the budget, got the rule set for reconciliation so the Senate can pass a bill in reconciliation with 51 votes instead of 60.

Of course, the majority leader could say: You know what? This is such a critical promise we made about healthcare that, just like the Reid rule, when it is really, really important, we will set aside the 60-vote cloture rule so that we can get something done, whether it is a confirmation, whatever it is, that saves lives, helps Americans.

Well, if there was ever a bill that fit that situation, it would be one that helped save lives through repealing at least the biggest, worst parts of ObamaCare.

Nonetheless, under that reconciliation procedure, we have until September 30 to get it done with 51 votes. I have got to say, earlier this summer—I have been here 12½ years. I have never seen a situation where the majority party in the Senate was calling those in the majority party in the House, including the Speaker and the leadership team, and calling those of us in the House Freedom Caucus, calling those in the Tuesday Group, and their one big question—I have never heard of this happening in American history—their big question was: Would you please promise us that, if we pass this bill in the Senate, you promise us you will not take up our bill and pass it as it is, because the only chance we have, we are told, of passing this bill in the Senate is if we know for sure it won't become law.

I have never heard of that happening before, but that is what happened this summer. From our Speaker on down, our different groups: Yes, we promise you we won't let that bad bill you're voting on become law. We will make sure it goes to conference, and we will get something a lot better than that that we send to the House and Senate to vote on.

It didn't get passed, and we have until September 30 to keep from being about as big a bunch of liars as has ever been in Congress. That is it.

I am very grateful—again, here, I appreciate the Appropriations Committee, and I will express appreciation here, now, for Speaker PAUL RYAN, because he has agreed with me and some others about the kind of pressure we are going to put on when we get back the last week of September if the Senate has not passed their ObamaCare repeal bill. They have got to pass something or we can't get it to conference. We can't get the American public what they need.

Now, some of you have said: Well, if you had just passed that first bill the Republican leaders had put together. Well, I am not sure who put it together. It may have been the remaining health insurance companies and Big Pharma, from what I could tell, but it was not going to do anybody any good except the insurance companies and Big Pharma. It was not going to help rank-and-file Americans the way we promised them we would help them.

There are some that say: Yeah, but, Louie, if you guys had just voted ''yes'' immediately on that bill, it would have gotten wind in the sails of the President and we would already have tax reform.

Well, I am here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, if we had passed that first bill, and when people saw their premiums continuing to shoot up and their deductibles continuing to shoot up and just these overwhelming prices, it would not have been wind in the sails of President Trump. It would have meant that people would have been so angry, a lot of Republicans would have stayed home and a lot of Democrats who voted for Donald Trump and Members of the Republican House and Senate, they would stay home or they would go out and vote for someone else, and the first order of business in January 2019 would probably have been, when we lost the majority, the impeachment of President Trump. It shouldn't be. It is not appropriate, but that is probably what would have happened if we had just jumped on that first bad bill.

We have got a good bill. We have still got a chance. We have got to get this done for the good of America. If we can't get this done, we have no business being in the majority. It just brings you to just throw up your hands: My goodness, what good is this?

I will also say, Mr. Speaker, the old adage is true: democracy ensures a people are governed no better than they deserve.

We have got too many Americans across this country that are not paying attention. They are like some friends I had in high school that said: Well, Louie, I don't care what the government does as long as they stay out of my business. Well, they have come to find out, if you don't care what the government does, they are not going to stay out of your business; they are going to take it over—your life, your business, everything.

People have got to get reengaged, pay attention, get out and vote, and we have got a chance to get it fixed. It is absolutely essential before September 30, at midnight, that we get something done to help the American people.

I am looking forward, if the Senate doesn't get a decent bill done, I want us to pass a sense of the House bill right here in the House that says it is the sense of the House that the Senate absolutely must pass a bill to give the American public the help they need with healthcare by repealing the worst parts of ObamaCare, at a minimum.

□ 1330

And then follow the Speaker out here on the steps, and every one of us point to the Senate, and keep putting the pressure on. Keep on putting the pressure on until, hopefully, they do something.

But it may be that they get it done. We don't have to get into a battle of words and wits like that. The American public is expecting it. We promised it. We have got to get that done. In the meantime, I know there is a lot of discussion, a lot of calls today about, oh, gee, the President is talking about DACA this, and DACA that.

I have spent so many hours, so many nights, down on the border all night long, and I always heard the same things from my friends in the Border Patrol. Every time anybody in Congress, or in the administration, starts talking about, well, we are working out a deal for amnesty for this, or to legalize that, then we get a huge surge in people coming across our southern border.

So I will continue to refuse to make statements about what I think about—should we agree to this; should we compromise on this legalization, this amnesty? Because every time we do, people get lured into the United States.

When that happens, there are always some that get drawn into sex slavery. Some get drawn into being mules and drug dealers for the drug cartels; and some—we have seen the video, we have seen the evidence—they die trying to get in.

We should not be luring people in. We need to secure the border. That includes building a wall where we need it. We don't need one in Big Bend National Park, in my opinion. If you can get across Big Bend National Park carrying all of the water you are going to need to get clear across there, then I want you in America, and I want you in our military. You are an extraordinary person. We don't need a wall through Big Bend National Park, most of it, anyway, but there are places we do.

We have got to secure the border. If you go down there, south of McAllen, the river is wide, flowing fast. If you just have people along the river—I have been there, I know. The coyotes will not bring people across if they see there is law enforcement that will stop them. The trouble was, during the Obama administration, they didn't stop them. They didn't even process them when they got across. I have seen it.

Why wouldn't you stop them? Why wouldn't you say: No, you are not coming on to U.S. land. Go back. Come in legally. We want you, but you have got to come in legally.

It is time to secure the border. President Trump is making great strides in that area. General Kelly—God bless him—he was making great strides when he was head of Homeland Security. I was so thrilled he was there. I knew about the things he was doing, and I sure hope it continues, whoever replaces him. But we have got to secure our border, build a wall where it is needed.

We have got to repeal ObamaCare—the worst parts of it, anyway—and get people the help they need.

We have also got to give them the tax reform they need. As Art Laffer told me—he was asking me: Louie, you know, once we got that 30 percent tax cut in 1983, the third year of the President Reagan administration, do you know what the rate of growth was? Here we have been talking about 1.92 percent. It was 8 percent or over when they had the big tax cut.

People got jobs. They made more money than ever. It was incredible. It is time to get back to that kind of growth. It is time to get back to a healthcare system where we are not slaves to a health insurance company, and we are not slaves to the U.S. Government, where we have control of our doctor-patient relationship, and America can heal; it can grow; it can prosper.

We can bring back manufacturing jobs, which are so critical to this Nation, but we have got to get it done, and it has got to start this month.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOHO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of assisting Floridians in recovery efforts from Hurricane Irma.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to AN enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 49. Condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the first responders who lost their lives while monitoring the events, offering deepest condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed and deepest sympathies and support to those individuals who were injured by the violence, expressing support for the Charlottesville community, rejecting White nationalists, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups, and urging the President and the President's Cabinet to use all available resources to address the threats posed by those groups.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 18, 2017, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2537. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Black Stem Rust; Additions of Rust-Resistant Species and Varieties [Docket No.: APHIS-2017-0049] received September 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2538. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Specialty Crops Program, Specialty Crops Inspection Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S. Standards for Grades of Shelled Walnuts and Walnuts in the Shell [Document No.: AMS-SC-16-0005, SC-16-331] received September 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2539. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General Ronald P. Clark, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of major 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.

2540. A letter from the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, Executive Director/Designated Federal Official, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for FY 2017, pursuant to Sec. 114(e) of the Higher Education Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2541. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Prohibition of Children's Toys and Child Care Articles Containing Specified Phthalates: Determinations Regarding Certain Plastics [Docket No.: CPSC-2016-0017] received September 7, 2017, 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.

2542. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safeguarding of Restricted Data by Access Permittees [Docket No.: DOE-HQ-2015-0029-0001] (RIN: 1992-AA46) received September 1, 2017, 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.

2543. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's interpretive rule — Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturer Assistance Program received September 1, 2017, 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.

2544. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2545. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled, ''2016 Human Rights Report For International Military Education and Training Participants'', pursuant to Sec. 549 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2546. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended (RIN: 1400-AD30) received September 7, 2017, 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.

2547. 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-2016-9508; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-065-AD; Amendment 39-18956; AD 2017-14-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 31, 2017, 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.

2548. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Award Term (NFS Case 2016-N027) (RIN: 2700-AE32) received August 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2549. A letter from the Chief, Reg. Spec. Project, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supportive Services for Veteran Families Program (RIN: 2900-AP61) received September 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. House Resolution 479. Resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Treasury to provide to the House of Representatives the tax return information of President Donald J. Trump as well as the tax returns of each business entity disclosed by Donald J. Trump on his Office of Government Ethics Form 278e (Rept. 115–309); adversely Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Luis V. Gutiérrez (Rept. 115–310). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2374. A bill to facilitate certain pinyon-juniper related projects in Lincoln County, Nevada, to modify the boundaries of certain wilderness areas in the State of Nevada, and to fully implement the White Pine County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act (Rept. 115–311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2423. A bill to implement certain measures relating to management of Washington County, Utah, required by Public Law 111–11 (Rept. 115–312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHABOT: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 2763. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and Small Business Technology Transfer program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–313, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 2763. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and Small Business Technology Transfer program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–313, Pt. 2). 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. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 3771. A bill to ensure independent investigations by allowing judicial review of the removal of a special counsel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 3772. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide specific credit risk retention requirements to certain qualifying collateralized loan obligations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. WALZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BASS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. DELBENE, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 3773. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 and the Head Start Act to promote child care and early learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 3774. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to allow the release of education records to facilitate the award of a recognized postsecondary credential; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JONES, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRAT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 3775. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a skills-based immigration points system, to focus family-sponsored immigration on spouses and minor children, to eliminate the Diversity Visa Program, to set a limit on the number of refugees admitted annually to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYCE of California (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3776. A bill to support United States international cyber diplomacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 3777. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest System land containing the Nephi Work Center in Juab County, Utah, to Juab County; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 3778. A bill to award grants for the recruitment, retention, and advancement of direct care workers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 3779. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to develop a plan for the removal of the monument to Robert E. Lee at the Antietam National Battlefield, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3780. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide under the Medicare program for conditions of participation, reporting requirements, and a quality program with respect to air ambulance services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 3781. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to develop guidelines regarding the use by the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of unofficial sources of information to determine the eligibility of a member or former member of the Armed Forces for benefits and decorations when the member's service records are incomplete because of damage to the records, including records damaged by a 1973 fire at the National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis, Missouri; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JUDY CHU of

California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HECK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 3782. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a national strategic action plan and program to assist health professionals in preparing for and responding to the public health effects of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 3783. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer credit checks against prospective and current employees for the purposes of making adverse employment decisions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 3784. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the treatment of technical errors in applications for Federal TRIO programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 3785. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 3786. A bill to require the Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere to update periodically the environmental sensitivity index products of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for each coastal area of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 3787. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for streamlined procedures for waiver petitions seeking relief for small entities from regulations issued by the Federal Communications Commission, to require the Commission to defer the application of new regulations to small entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3788. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for a Northeast Gasoline Supply Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. YODER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 3789. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the President's Council on Fitness, Sports, and Nutrition, to conduct a study on the causes of deaths related to high school football and formulate recommendations to prevent such deaths; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3790. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to enhance penalties for certain thefts of a firearm from certain Federal firearms licensees, and to criminalize the theft of a firearm from a gun range that rents firearms or a shooting club; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 3791. A bill to ensure that United States Government personnel, including members of the Armed Forces and contractors, assigned to United States diplomatic missions are given the opportunity to designate next-of-kin for certain purposes in the event of the death of the personnel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3792. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to require that covered persons develop and implement emergency contingency plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 3793. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to consider the appropriate inclusion of residential manufactured homes in certain programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 3794. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to carry out a program to prevent flooding and wastewater, sewage, trash, and sediment spills in the Tijuana River Valley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 3795. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to carry out a comprehensive protection and rehabilitation program for the Tijuana River Valley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to assist in the support of children living in poverty by allowing a refundable credit to grandparents of those children for the purchase of household items for the benefit of those children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3797. A bill to withhold United States contributions to the regularly assessed biennial budget of the United Nations until the United Nations adopts a definition of ''international terrorism'' concurrent with United States laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. YOHO, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3798. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 3799. A bill to direct the Justice Department to pursue civil actions to eliminate patterns or practices of civil rights violations by police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LEE, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 3800. A bill to eliminate mandatory minimum sentences for all drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Congress and the States should consider a constitutional amendment to reform the Electoral College and establish a process for electing the President and Vice President by a national popular vote and should encourage individual States to continue to reform the Electoral College process through such steps as the formation of an interstate compact to award the majority of Electoral College votes to the national popular vote winner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. RASKIN):

H. Res. 520. A resolution expressing solidarity with, and pledging support and assistance to, victims of Hurricane Harvey, commending the first responders and civilian volunteers who saved lives threatened by Hurricane Harvey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H. Res. 521. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives about a strategy to deploy fifth generation mobile networks (5G networks) and next-generation wireless and wired technologies to promote economic development and digital innovation throughout the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 522. A resolution recognizing the twentieth anniversary of the International Career Advancement Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 523. A resolution expressing disapproval of any act of the President to grant to himself or any member of his family, including those related solely by marriage, a reprieve or pardon for an offense against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CORREA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MOORE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VELA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HECK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BERA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. BASS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H. Res. 524. A resolution recognizing ispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H. Res. 525. A resolution designating September 16, 2017, as ''Isaac M. Wise Temple Day''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Mr. RASKIN):

H. Res. 526. A resolution congratulating the National Federation of Federal Employees on the celebration of its 100th anniversary and recognizing its members' vital contributions to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H. Res. 527. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 18, 2017, through September 24, 2017, as ''Balance Awareness Week''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H. Res. 528. A resolution condemning horrific acts of violence against Burma's Rohingya population and calling on Aung San Suu Kyi to play an active role in ending this humanitarian tragedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

120. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 101, urging the United States Congress and the Louisiana Congressional Delegation to rectify the revenue sharing inequities between coastal and interior energy producing states and to ensure the dependability of such revenue sharing; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

121. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 239, expressing opposition to the proposed elimination of Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) and urging the United States Congress to continue funding LIHEAP in Federal Fiscal Year 2018; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. HUFFMAN introduced a bill (H.R. 3801) for the relief of Hugo Mejia; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. CONYERS:

H.R. 3771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 9 and 18

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 3772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.)

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 3774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 3775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution enumerating congressional authority ''[t]o establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.''

By Mr. ROYCE of California:

H.R. 3776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 3777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 3779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 3780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 3781.

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 which provides Congress with the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises in order to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes).

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 3784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 3785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R 3786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 3789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to tbe powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of tbe House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of tbe accompanying bill.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 3791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. 1 §1; and

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 18.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3792.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 3793.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 3794.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 3795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 ofArticle 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 and Amendment I, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 40: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 44: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 154: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 173: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 367: Mr. HOLDING and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 392: Mr. BLUM, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 395: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 422: Mr. OLSON and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 424: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 490: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 502: Mr. TURNER and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 620: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 631: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 675: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 676: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 685: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 694: Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 812: Mr. RUSH and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 848: Mr. GIANFORTE.

H.R. 964: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1038: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1148: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1150: Mr. MESSER and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 1225: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MAST, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JONES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARINO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BLUM, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 1274: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1311: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1318: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1360: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1468: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1626: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1631: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1699: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1762: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1810: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1836: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1865: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1974: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2057: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2121: Mr. BUDD and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 2147: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2150: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2151: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 2193: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2242: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2273: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 2295: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 2319: Mr. FLORES and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 2321: Mr. BOST, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2383: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2405: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2408: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2431: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2439: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2472: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2482: Mr. BERA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2499: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2575: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2589: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 2612: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2623: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2651: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2670: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2723: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 2735: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2745: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2790: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2792: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2824: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2840: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2851: Mr. REED and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 2856: Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 2862: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 2890: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 2909: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 2946: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 2973: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3030: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3032: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 3034: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 3035: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3071: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 3079: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3122: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3131: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3167: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 3227: Ms. NORTON and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 3236: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3258: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3274: Mr. YODER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. COOK, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3275: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 3316: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3397: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3441: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LONG, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3451: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3473: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3549: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3565: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3632: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 3635: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3668: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3681: Mr. BEYER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3692: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3695: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. VELA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3699: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3701: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3708: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 3711: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BOST, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3721: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3729: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 3739: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3740: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3749: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3757: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3761: Mr. HARPER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3770: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. HIMES and Mr. CAPUANO.
H. Res. 257: Mr. YODER and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 274: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 353: Mr. CONYERS.
H. Res. 495: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H. Res. 507: Mrs. DINGELL.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 3 by Mr. GARRETT on House Resolution 458: Mr. DeSantis, Mr. Harris, Mr. Schweikert, Mr. Rokita, Mr. Gaetz and Mr. Brooks of Alabama.

Petition 4 by Mr. COFFMAN on H.R. 496: Ms. Titus.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2017 No. 149

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN HOEVEN, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, from whom comes all holy desires, we thank You for all those who give their lives to serve You and country. May they realize that they are doing Your work on Earth when they strive faithfully to follow Your precepts.

Use our lawmakers to bring comfort, renewal, and empowerment to our Nation and world. Take them along yet untrodden paths, through perils unknown, to Your desired destination. May they live in peace and contentment, resting in the knowledge that You are directing their steps.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 14, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN HOEVEN, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOEVEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senators will keep working to pass the National Defense Authorization Act, the legislation that authorizes the resources, capabilities, pay, and benefits that our servicemembers rely on to be successful.

The operational missions and tasks ahead for our men and women in uniform are as profuse as they are challenging. That is why it is essential that we meet our commitment to them by providing the equipment and the training they need to accomplish their missions. We should always remember that we have an all-volunteer force, and, in turn, we must support our warriors with the pay and benefits they and their families count on at home. This National Defense Authorization Act touches on every one of these issues.

We have already made an initial downpayment toward rebuilding the military and restoring combat readiness with the spring funding bill. Let's take this opportunity to add to that progress now.

As Chairman MCCAIN pointed out yesterday, this bill is the product of hard work from both sides. In committee, Republicans and Democrats offered scores of amendments that were ultimately adopted to the bill that is before us, and all 27 of the Armed Services Committee members voted favorably to report this bill out. So there is no reason it shouldn't earn the same kind of bipartisan backing from the full Senate now.

I look forward to taking a vote in support of the men and women in uniform who courageously put their lives on the line to protect and defend each of us. As I do so, I will be thinking of the servicemembers and their families back in my home State of Kentucky, and I know so many other colleagues will be thinking of the servicemembers in their home States and those deployed abroad as well.

Let's keep working to bring this Defense authorization bill over the finish line.

BURMA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in recent weeks the plight of the Rohingya has received great international attention. Even in the best of times, this beleaguered ethnic minority has eked out a marginal existence in Burma's Rakhine State. The Rohingya are stateless and have faced discrimination and isolation. Media reports indicate that their existence has gotten much worse over the past several weeks.

I am deeply troubled by the humanitarian situation along the Burmese-Bangladesh border and the violence in the Rakhine State must stop. But as I stated earlier this week, in my view, publicly condemning Aung San Suu Kyi—the best hope for democratic reform in Burma—is simply not constructive.

Yesterday I had a chance to speak with Suu Kyi on the phone. I would emphasize that she is the same person she was before. Her position in the Burmese Government is an exceedingly difficult one; she is State Counsellor. But, by law, her civilian government has virtually no authority over the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Burmese military. According to the Burmese Constitution, the Army is essentially autonomous, and it has control on the ground of the Rohingya situation.

Unfounded criticism of Suu Kyi exaggerates her ability to command the military, which the Burmese Constitution does not actually allow her to do, and the political evolution of representative government in that country is certainly not over. She must work—and is working—to promote peace and reconciliation within her national context. But Burma's path toward a democratic government is not yet complete, and it will not miraculously occur overnight.

I would like to report to the Senate that during our call, Daw Suu agreed with the need for immediate and improved access of humanitarian assistance to the region, particularly by the International Red Cross, and she conveyed that she is working toward that end. She reiterated her view of the universality of human dignity and the pressing need to pursue peace and reconciliation among the communities in Rakhine State.

Daw Suu emphasized to me that violations of human rights will need to be addressed. Moreover, she stressed that the situation in the Rakhine State is a protracted, longstanding problem and that she is trying very hard to improve conditions. We will soon receive a follow-on briefing from her office.

Right now, the most important thing is for the violence of the Rakhine State to stop and to try to ensure the rapid flow of humanitarian aid through both Burma and Bangladesh to the affected areas to help the Rohingyan refugees and internally displaced persons. That is where our focus should be.

Burma's path to representative government is not at all certain, and it certainly is not over. Attacking the single political leader who has worked to further democracy within Burma is likely to hinder that objective over the long run.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, comprehensive tax reform represents the single most important action we can take now to grow the economy and help middle-class families get ahead. It is the President's high priority. It is a priority we share here in Congress. The work of the tax-writing committees on tax reform goes back literally years, and it continues today.

This morning, the Senate Finance Committee will hold another in a series of hearings on comprehensive tax reform. Under the leadership of Chairman HATCH, the committee is working to simplify the tax system to make it work better for American individuals, families, and businesses. As Chairman HATCH knows, our current Tax Code is overly complex, with rates that are too high and incentives that often literally make no sense.

Senator HATCH understands how our broken code makes it harder for American businesses of all sizes to compete and win in an increasingly competitive global economy—how it actually incentivizes our companies to ship operations and American jobs overseas. Chairman HATCH and colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand how our broken code makes it harder for middle-class families to succeed—how it depresses wages, weighs down job creation, and crushes opportunity.

It is time to fundamentally rethink our Tax Code to make taxes lower, simpler, and fairer for American families. Fortunately, we have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to do that.

This morning's hearing in the Senate Finance Committee is a part of the wide-ranging conversation to shift the economy into high gear after 8 years of an Obama economy that too often hurt the middle class and seemed to hardly work for anyone but the ultrawealthy.

With lower taxes and a growing economy, jobs can come back from overseas and stay here, families can keep more money in their pockets to spend in the way they want to, and individuals can have access to more opportunities to buy a new home, to start a new business, or to send their kids to college. To put it simply: Our efforts are about more jobs, more opportunity, and more money in the pockets of the middle class.

Without tax reform, American families will be forced to continue living under an unfair Tax Code with rates that are too high, American jobs will continue to be shipped overseas, and small businesses will be increasingly uncompetitive against foreign companies. That does not benefit the middle class. These are the real consequences of the current Tax Code, and we should all want to work together to put an end to it. Our friends on the other side of the aisle say they support comprehensive reform of the system, and I hope they will join us in this effort in a serious way.

Finally, I thank President Trump and his team for their work throughout this tax process. We will continue to regularly engage with them, working together to bring relief to the American people.

I also thank Chairman HATCH for his leadership on this issue. Along with my colleagues, I will keep working to deliver relief and economic hope to our middle class.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Good morning, Mr. President.

As we continue to work on the NDAA, the Democratic side is committed to working with the Republican side in good faith to finish this very important legislation. I am pleased that the managers have already been able to include more than 100 amendments in the substitute. I hope we can do another package today.

Senators MCCAIN and REED are managing this bill with their usual great skill, and I very much appreciate their hard work. Particularly, I know how important this legislation is to Senator MCCAIN and that he wants to see it through and see it through as soon as possible. We are going to help in that regard, of course.

DACA AND BORDER SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, last night, Leader PELOSI and I had a constructive meeting with President Trump and several members of his Cabinet.

One of our most productive discussions was about the DACA Program, to which we all agreed on a framework: to pass DACA protections and additional border security measures, excluding the wall. We agreed that the President would support enshrining the DACA protections into law. In fact, it is something, he stated, that for a while has needed to be done. The President also encouraged the House and Senate to act.

What remains to be negotiated are the details of border security with the mutual goal of finalizing all of the details as soon as possible. While both sides agreed that the wall would not be any part of this agreement, the President made clear that he intends to pursue it at a later time, and we made clear that we would continue to oppose it.

If you listened to the President's comments this morning and to Director Mulvaney's comments this morning, it is clear that what Leader PELOSI and I put out last night was exactly accurate and was confirmed again this morning by our statement, by the President's statement before he got on the helicopter to go to Florida, and by Director Mulvaney's comments. We have reached an understanding on this issue, but we have to work out details, and we can work together on a border security package with the White House to get DACA on the floor quickly.

Let me talk for a minute about border security. We Democrats are for border security. We passed a robust border security package as part of immigration reform in 2013, as the Acting President pro tempore knows better than anybody else. We are not for the wall, and we will never be for the wall. It is expensive, it is ineffective, and it involves a lot of difficult eminent domain—taking people's property—and, apparently, it is not being paid for by Mexico. In fact, I listened to FOX News this morning—I am starting to do that to see what is going on over there—and they keep saying that in the campaign the President promised a wall. Yes. He

also promised that Mexico would pay for it. Where is Mexico? It has said 12 times that it is not paying for it. That is not the promise he made.

Finally, on the wall, it sends a terrible symbol to the world about the United States—about who we are, what kind of country we are. Since the 1880s, a beautiful statue in the harbor of the city in which I live has been the symbol of America to the world—that great torch that symbolizes what a noble land we are. Can you imagine, if in future decades, that symbol were to be replaced with a big, foreboding wall? That is not who America is, was, or, hopefully, will be.

As I mentioned, we are for sensible border security, and there are many more effective ways of securing the border than by building a wall. A wall can be scaled over. I am sure that those who love the wall have heard of ladders. A wall can be tunneled under. I am sure that those who support the wall have heard of shovels. It is a medieval solution for a modern problem—a ''Game of Thrones'' idea for a world that is a lot closer to ''Star Wars.'' The thing is that we have new, modern solutions that use our best technology. We discussed some of them at the White House last night.

Drones. These drones can spot the difference between a deer and a human being crossing the border. We have great sensory equipment, and our military has specialized in this kind of stuff. A lot of it is made in Syracuse, NY, I am proud to say. We can rebuild roads along the border. Talk to the people in the Border Patrol, and they will say that a lot of places do not have roads so that, if they see someone crossing the border, they cannot get to them. Of course, there is the bipartisan McCaul-Thompson bill in the House—MCCAUL, a Republican, and THOMPSON, a Democrat—that has broad, bipartisan support and that sets certain standards. Every one of these ideas would provide better, more effective border security than would a medieval wall.

There is still much to be done. We have to put meat on the bones of the agreement, and the details will matter, but it was a very, very positive step for the President to commit to DACA protections without insisting on the inclusion of or even a debate about the border wall.

EQUIFAX DATA BREACH

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the Equifax data breach, what has transpired over the past several months is one of the most egregious examples of corporate malfeasance since Enron. Equifax has exposed the most sensitive personal information of over half of the citizens of the United States—names, addresses, Social Security numbers, driver's licenses, and, in some cases, even their credit histories. Clearly, there were inadequate data security standards at Equifax, which is deeply troubling on a number of levels.

When you are a credit agency like Equifax, you have two principal jobs: calculating and reporting accurate credit scores and protecting the sensitive information of individuals that is funneled through that process. Stunningly and epically, Equifax failed to perform one of its two essential duties as a company—protecting the sensitive information of the people in its files. That is unacceptable, and there is no other word for it.

Even following the failure by Equifax—this huge, massive failure—the company and its leadership failed to effectively communicate this breach to the public and, in the aftermath of the announcement, failed to address public concern. The company knew about the breach and did not notify consumers that their information had been compromised for far too long a period. Because Equifax waited so long to report the breach, consumers were put behind the eight ball. Their information was potentially compromised without their knowledge, and they had no ability to protect themselves. Meanwhile, hackers could attempt to take out loans in their names and potentially use the information for identity fraud or they could perpetrate a number of fraudulent schemes with the sensitive information that these horrible hackers had obtained.

Once the breach was eventually announced, consumers found themselves being forced to provide sensitive information to Equifax in order to verify whether they were impacted by the breach. In order to sign up for the company's credit monitoring services, customers were forced to agree to terms prohibiting their ability to bring a legal claim against Equifax. Isn't that disgusting?

Equifax creates the problem and then says: Customer, if you want to solve it, you have to give up your rights.

That is outrageous.

Equifax is saying: We royally screwed up, but trust us. We will not screw up again, but if we do screw up, you cannot sue us.

To make matters worse, in the weeks leading up to the announcement of its breach, while customers were in the dark, several executives at Equifax sold off their stock in the company. They claim that they had no knowledge of the breach. If they did, it would be one of the most brazen and shameful attempts of insider trading that I can recall.

We need to get to the bottom of this—the very bottom, the murky bottom, the dirty bottom. The Senate must hold hearings on the Equifax breach during which these executives will be called to account. There is no question about that. Beyond that, five things need to happen in the near future. I would like to see them in the next week.

First, Equifax must commit proactively to reach out to all impacted individuals and notify them that their personal, identifiable information may have been compromised and, if known, inform them of exactly what information has been released.

Second, provide credit monitoring and ID theft protection services to all impacted individuals for no less than 10 years. If an individual chooses not to use the credit monitoring service offered by Equifax because they naturally don't trust them, then Equifax should reimburse that individual for the costs of the alternative credit monitoring service they sign up for.

Third, offer any impacted individual the ability to freeze their credit at any point for up to 10 years.

Fourth, remove arbitration provisions from any agreement or terms of use for products, services, or disclosures offered by Equifax. This means that Equifax will proactively come into compliance with the CFPB's forced arbitration rule, and there will be no question that an individual will not have all legal rights at their disposal.

Fifth, Equifax must agree to testify before the Senate, the FTC, and the SEC, cooperate with any investigation, and comply with any fines, penalties, or new standards that are recommended at the conclusion of these investigations.

If Equifax does not agree to these five things in 1 week's time, the CEO of the company and the entire board should step down. These five steps are common sense. They are the baseline of decency. If Equifax can't commit to them, their leadership is not up to the job, and the entire leadership must be replaced.

Let me tell my colleagues, if Joe Public—if the average citizen did anything close to what the corporate leaders of Equifax did that led to this data breach and the awful response to it, that average citizen would be fired immediately. To give Equifax a week to implement these things is overly generous to people who did horrible stuff and then, after it happened, did nothing—virtually nothing—that showed they had remorse.

It is only right that the CEO and board step down if they can't reach this modicum of corporate decency by next week.

TAX REFORM

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Mr. President—a lot to say this morning—a word on taxes. Last night at the White House, President Trump said he didn't want his tax plan to benefit the very wealthy. That is a good thing. We Democrats agree. Forty-five of the forty-eight of us signed a letter that no tax breaks should go to the top 1 percent. They are doing great. God bless them. I am glad they are doing well. They don't need a tax break. Middle-class people do.

But the devil, when the President says that, is always in the details, and we haven't seen any details. We haven't seen anything resembling a

plan yet. We hear it is being written in a back room by the so-called Big 6—all Republican—but I haven't seen it, Ranking Member WYDEN hasn't seen it, and no Democrat in the Senate has seen it.

I can tell you one thing: If the President's tax plan repeals or rolls back the estate tax, it will be clear that a lot of this plan benefits the very rich, contrary to all of his words.

I would remind everyone that only 5,200 of the over 2.7 million estates in this country will pay any taxes this year. The estate tax only kicks in when couples with estates of nearly $11 million transfer their wealth. Go to North Dakota—and I know the Acting President pro tempore has nice family farms out there—and ask how many have an estate worth $11 million, and if they do, I am willing to exempt from the estate tax a family farm that is over that. But almost no one does.

A study by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities showed that of the 5,200 estates—here we have 2.7 million estates. Only 5,200 qualify for the estate tax because they are worth $11 million, and of those, 50 are small farms or businesses—50. Let's exempt those 50. Let's make all of these other guys pay. We need the money. They are rich. God bless them.

So when President Trump says the estate tax is a burden on the family farmer, I honestly don't know what he is talking about. There may be a few. They may make a lot of noise. God bless them. That is their right as Americans. There are very, very few. That is not what the facts say.

Let me show my colleagues the next chart. Of 2.7 million taxable estates, just 50 are farms and small businesses that would benefit from the repeal of the estate tax—2.7 million; 50.

There was an amazing moment last night at the meeting we held at the White House when the estate tax came up, and a few of the President's advisers said: Oh, no one pays the estate tax. There have even been news reports that Gary Cohn has told Members of Congress that ''only morons pay the estate tax.'' What they mean, of course, is that rich people—people rich enough to be levied estate taxes—can find ways around paying them; they can afford all of those lawyers and estate planners.

Well, first, they are wrong. Repealing the estate tax would add $269 billion to the deficit over 10 years—$269 billion. So there are a lot of people paying the estate tax. Maybe they are morons, as Gary Cohn once called them, maybe they are not, but there is a lot of money out there that comes in from these very wealthy with the estate tax.

Second, Mr. Cohn and the others who say this bring up an important point. The right thing to do is not repeal the estate tax but close the loopholes. If you have an estate worth that much, you should be paying the estate tax, not finding clever ways to avoid your tax obligation. Again, if you are rich, if you have a big estate, God bless you. That is the American way. But pay your fair share. Pay your fair share.

Democrats want to participate in reforming our Tax Code. There are lots of good things we can agree on—closing loopholes like this one, cutting taxes for the middle class, helping small businesses, bringing offshore deferred income back into the United States.

We have laid out three principles: no reconciliation—that means do it together, not how they did healthcare, which didn't end up with a great result; second, no tax cuts for the top 1 percent, who are doing just fine, God bless them; third, fiscal responsibility—we should not increase the deficit as we cut taxes, particularly now that we are going to have to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to help the beleaguered States of Texas and Florida.

Some Republicans have characterized those three principles as lines in the sand that show that Democrats aren't serious about tax reform. So I would ask my Republican colleagues, which of the three do you not agree with? Do you think we should cut taxes on the top 1 percent? Do you think we should create deficits by cutting taxes on the wealthy? Do you think you should just go at this alone? If you agree with those, fine. Say so. Don't say that these are lines in the sand. We are offering some policy guidance that has virtually unanimous support in our caucus.

By the way, these three principles guided the 1986 tax reform, which was the most successful tax reform we have had in decades.

It seems to me it is not Democrats who would move the goalpost on tax reform but some Republicans who no longer want to play by the same rules.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to my dear friend, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who is doing a great job getting this bill through.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2810, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain/Reed modified amendment No. 1003, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for MCCAIN) amendment No. 545 (to amendment No. 1003), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend from New York. I thank him for the cooperation we have gotten in the consideration of this important legislation.

I would just ask the Democratic leader, is it reasonable to assume that we could finish this up today or set a time for it on Monday?

Mr. SCHUMER. Absolutely.

Mr. MCCAIN. Good. I hope we can do that.

I again thank the leader from New York, who has been very cooperative to me and to the Senator from Rhode Island as we have moved forward with this legislation. I thank him.

TRAINING ACCIDENT AT CAMP PENDLETON

Mr. President, I wish to begin by offering my thoughts and prayers to the marines who were injured yesterday when their amphibious assault vehicle caught fire during a training exercise at Camp Pendleton in California. With 15 marines hospitalized and 5 in critical condition, I join all of my colleagues in hoping for a full and speedy recovery for each of these brave young servicemembers.

Last night, unfortunately, the majority leader was required to file cloture on the National Defense Authorization Act for 2018. We have gotten a lot done in the short time this legislation has been on the floor. I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say that it is my hope that we will be able to do more.

I thank my friend from Rhode Island. I thank Members who have been very helpful and cooperative in this effort, as we have considered a 27-to-0 vote through the committee. It passed unanimously. We have engaged in spirited, thoughtful debate, and we have ultimately adopted 277 amendments from both Republicans and Democrats.

I sound like a broken record, but this is the way the Senate should conduct business. The authorizing committee reports out legislation that has been examined with hearings and debate and amendments, and it appears on the floor, and we have additional debates and amendments, and people can vote yes or no, but they are informed.

It is a violation of our oath of office when we are told that one-fifth of the gross national product—i.e. healthcare—is going to be decided by a ''skinny repeal'' that none of us had seen until an hour or two before. That is not the way the Senate should do business.

We are not perfect. We are going to have to invoke cloture on this bill. We are not going to have some debate and votes on some very important—at least four—issues. But while we have been on this bill, we have adopted 277 amendments. We had hours and hours of hearings. We had a week of putting this bill

together on a bipartisan basis, and it was reported out by over one-quarter of the Senate, to zero. That is the way we should be doing business.

I will freely admit that national security probably is at a higher level of importance—and should be—than the average legislation, but shouldn't we learn from this that if we sit down together, we argue, we fight, we debate, and then we reach consensus, we come to the floor of the Senate and to the American people with something that we are proud of and that we can defend?

As I mentioned, there are still some issues that we are negotiating on, back and forth—and we are negotiating—and hopefully we can get those done before cloture is invoked. I hope the majority leader and the Democratic leader will agree to a time certain for final passage.

Let me just say that I support beginning to move toward final passage, which will provide our Armed Forces the resources they need.

By the way, again, I want to emphasize that on the Armed Services Committee, we have had dozens of hearings on topics such as the global threat environment, the effects of defense budget cuts, and military readiness and modernization. Those hearings informed the work of the committee as we moved toward the legislation.

I know that all of us from time to time like to take credit for accomplishments that maybe we are not as responsible for as we would advertise, but I want to say that I am not just proud of JOHN MCCAIN and JACK REED, I am proud of the 27 members of the Armed Services Committee who—and the debate was spirited. It is not the Bobbsey Twins. We fight in a spirited fashion. We defend what we believe in. But once the committee is decided, then we move on.

So my colleagues have embraced the spirit of that process, and we have submitted more than 500 amendments for consideration this week. The Senator from Rhode Island and I negotiated a number of very good amendments that have the support of both Republicans and Democrats. We still have some hard issues that are remaining, and I will be talking more about them. We are still negotiating to see if we can find agreement on those, and I am guardedly optimistic we can get most of that agreement done. We will know more later on this morning or early this afternoon.

Let me also point out to my colleagues what we are talking about. We have seen Navy ships, Army, and Marine Corps helicopters, Air Force planes crashing during routine training and operations, and these incidents have cost the lives of dozens of our men and women in uniform. There are many reasons for these tragedies, but the one this body cannot avoid responsibility for is that we are failing to provide our military with the resources they need to perform the missions we are asking of them. We are asking them to do too much with too little. The result is an overworked, strained force with aging equipment—and not enough of it.

We can point fingers and assign blame all we want, but at the end of the day, the constitutional responsibility to raise moneys and maintain Navies lies with us, with the Congress. That, of course, brings up sequestration, which I will address later on.

I just want to point out, again, the men and women who wear the uniform of our country are the best of our country, and they do everything we ask of them with great courage. It is time for this body to show a similar measure of courage and end the threat sequestration poses to their mission and their lives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I again thank the chairman for his leadership. It has been critical, as has been demonstrated throughout the process during our subcommittee hearings and our committee hearings, but even before that, the chairman insisted upon hearings that were comprehensive so, as we prepared for this NDAA, we had a sense of the threats we faced, the resources we needed, and, as a result, as the chairman pointed out, we were able to send to the floor, with a unanimous vote, a very strong defense bill.

Since that time, working together, we have been able to incorporate over 100 amendments which improve the bill. As the chairman pointed out, we are still working on issues we hope we can bring forward for either adoption or, through debate, a vote, and I hope we can do that. Again, as the chairman pointed out, this is a rare instance of regular order—of the committee report coming to the floor, moving to it by a strong vote, taking up and working to get amendments that are not controversial into the package, and then going ahead and, we hope, setting up debate, discussion, and votes on more difficult and challenging issues. I was encouraged by Senator SCHUMER's comment that we can anticipate a date for final passage of this bill.

We are confident we will have a national defense bill leaving the Senate and going to conference now. The final outline of that bill is still to be determined, and I hope we can add more to it. That is a very principled process of talking back-and-forth.

Again, I don't think any of this would have been done without the leadership of the chairman and his insistence that we adhere not only to regular order but that we don't forget this is ultimately about the men and women who serve us overseas.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island, my dear friend, JACK REED, is too kind. It takes two to tango. The partnership we have developed over the years has made it possible for us to get to the place we have in the past and we are today. He has not only my gratitude but that of the men and women who are serving because of his advocacy and his leadership.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REED. I thank the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I first thank Senator MCCAIN and Senator REED for their leadership, a model of bipartisanship at this incredibly important time with the rest of the world and the need to have a strong military. We know that. I think that is why we see this bill proceeding, but this bill will be so much stronger if we make sure that we not only defend our shores and stand by our troops but if we also defend the security of our democracy.

I so appreciate Senator MCCAIN and Senator REED supporting this amendment I have with Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina. This must be included in this bill. We are having a situation where one or two Members on the other side of the aisle are not allowing it to proceed. The timing is critical. The 2018 election is only 400-some days away, which is why you see us pushing this bill and doing everything we can to get it either included in the managers' package or to get a vote.

This amendment is supported by the Freedom Caucus, and in the House is led by the head of the Freedom Caucus. You may ask why. There are a lot of Republicans who would like to see States be able to keep running their own elections. I agree with that. I like the fact that we have decentralized elections, but the hacking was so real in this last election that our intelligence agencies have now established there were 21 States where there were attempts made to hack into their election software. We know this is going to happen again, and we must stand ready. We must protect our democracy.

Instead of having a successful hack attack in this next election, why don't we prepare ourselves so we can keep the decentralized nature of our elections? That is why we see such broad support for this amendment.

I came to the floor yesterday to fight for a vote—a simple up-or-down vote—on the bipartisan Klobuchar-Graham amendment. I also thank Senator LANKFORD of Oklahoma, as well as Senator HARRIS of California, for their bipartisan work and support for this amendment. This amendment has support, but one or two Members are blocking it—an amendment which has the support of the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee because they understand that election security is national security.

This provision simply says that it is the policy of the United States to defend against and respond to cyber attacks on our democratic system. You

have to have your head in the sand if you don't know that this has been a problem, whether you are in business and have had information stolen, whether you are someone who has been scammed or have had stuff sent to you on your email, or whether you are a voter who is concerned simply that when you are exercising your freedom to vote, someone is going to come in and steal your own private information or—worse yet—change what you did and change the result of an election.

In the words of Bruce Fein, a former Reagan official, ''Passing the Klobuchar-Graham amendment is imperative because public confidence in the reliability of elections is a cornerstone of national security.''

I am stunned we weren't simply able to include this amendment. I still have hope that we can. I am here to fight for this amendment so vigorously today because we need to get this done now. We need to get the authorization done now so we can start the process of putting grants out to States so they can upgrade their election equipment, have backup paper ballots, and simply employ the best practices that we believe we need to protect ourselves from the perpetrators in Russia or in any other foreign entity.

We need to make sure our election equipment in every big city and in every small town in America, in every county is as sophisticated as the bad guys who are trying to break into it. That is all this is about. I don't think anyone can go home to their constituents and say they blocked this. How on Earth can we pass a bill which authorizes billions of dollars in spending and refuses to simply authorize a relatively smaller amount of money to upgrade our election equipment?

Predictions are that this would cost about the same amount of money we spend on military bands every year—bands—music bands. I love military bands. There is nothing I like better, and I want to keep our military bands strong, but all Senator GRAHAM and I are saying is, I think maybe the protection of our entire election—guaranteeing the freedom of Americans to pick the candidate they choose, whether Republican or Democratic or Independent—is just as important as the music they hear celebrating our democracy. You can't have music celebrating our democracy if you don't have a fair democracy.

U.S. national securities have been sounding the alarm that our voting systems will continue to be a target in the future. The idea that we would pass the Defense authorization bill and not address this threat is mind-boggling. It is literally congressional malpractice.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, now run by the Trump administration, Russian hackers attempted to hack at least 21 States' election systems in 2016. Earlier this year, we also learned that Russia launched cyber attacks against a U.S. voting software company and the emails of more than 100 local election officials.

The former Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, recently testified that Russia will continue to interfere in our political system. This is what he said:

> I believe Russia is now emboldened to continue such activities in the future both here and around the world, and to do so even more intensely. If there has ever been a clarion call for vigilance and action against a threat to the very foundation of our democratic political system, this episode is it.

Vigilance, that is what we need right now. This is not about one party or the other. I think Senator RUBIO said it best when he said, well, one election it might affect one party and one candidate; the next election, it is going to affect the other. No one has any idea, when you are dealing with outside foreign entities that are trying to interfere with our democracy and trying to bring down our democracy in the eyes of the world—you don't know who they are going to affect. You just know they are trying to do it. So what do we do? We put in the necessary money in the Defense Authorization Act, an authorization for that to stop this from happening.

In order to safeguard future elections, State and local officials must have the tools and resources they need to prevent hacks and safeguard election infrastructure. They don't need those resources in 2 years. They don't need us debating this for 3 years. They need these resources now. Ask the secretaries of States—Democratic and Republican—who are supporting this bill all over the country, ask the local election officials, and they will tell you they need it now.

The next Federal election in 2018 is just 419 days away. As we know, it takes time for them to plan, it takes time for them to get the right equipment, and it takes time for them to get the information from cyber experts to make sure whether their systems are secure.

Experts agree that if we want to improve cyber security ahead of the 2018 election, we must act now. That is why I am fighting so hard for this amendment. I don't think we can just wait around and see if there is another bill we can attach it to next summer. No, that will not work. In order to protect our election systems, we need to do three things.

First, we must bring State and local election officials, cyber security experts, and national security personnel together to provide guidance on how States can best protect themselves. These recommendations should be easily accessible so every information officer and election official in every small town can access them. As we know, a lot of the States themselves still don't have full information about the hacking in the 21 States. That is a problem.

Many State officials I have talked to say they are still in the dark about threats to their election systems. That can't continue. We need our national security officials to be sharing information about the potential for attacks—not the day before the election, when they can't do anything, when they have a system that doesn't have paper ballot backups. No, they need that information now, and we need to help them not just get that information but make the changes they need. This means creating a framework for information sharing, which acts as an alarm system against cyber intruders. Our amendment would simply establish that alarm system.

Second, the Federal Government must provide States with the resources to implement the best practices developed by States and cyber security experts. A meaningful effort to protect our election systems will require those resources. As I mentioned before, predictions are that it is about the same amount of money that we spend every year on military bands. I think that is a bargain when you are looking to protect our democracy.

I think most Americans would agree with me—Republicans or Democrats, which is why there is such widespread support for this amendment—when I say that protecting our democracy from foreign cyber attacks and letting Americans have the freedom to decide who they want to elect, instead of someone in Russia, are probably money well spent.

Finally, we need better auditing of our elections. That means voter-verified paper ballot backup systems in every State. That is fundamental to protecting our elections and improving public confidence in the reliability of elections. Our amendment would accelerate the move to paper ballots by providing States with the resources they need to get there. The vast majority of our States simply don't have that system in place.

In short, our amendment would help States block cyber attacks, secure voter registration logs and voter data so that people don't get their addresses in the hands of a foreign government—or maybe even the data on whom they voted for or what party they belong to—upgrade auditing election procedures, and create secure and useful information sharing about threats.

I am not alone in this fight. As I mentioned, Senators GRAHAM, LANKFORD, and HARRIS are also pushing for the Senate to do its job and include this provision. Representative MEADOWS, the leader of the House Freedom Caucus, and Democratic Congressman JIM LANGEVIN have introduced companion legislation in the House.

Again, why is the Freedom Caucus strongly behind this bill? They are behind this bill because they want to preserve States' elections. They want to preserve the rights of States to have their own elections, and they are concerned enough because they have looked at the intelligence reports and have seen that this next election could blow it all up.

Are we just going to look back at it then? People who are holding this up, whose names will be revealed—are they then going to say ''Oops, I guess we made a mistake''?

No, it is going to be on their hands. It is going to be on their hands. This is the moment to do it.

I repeat: We need to get the authorization in place, so we can get the grant money out to the States so that they can upgrade their election equipment.

Dozens of former Republican national security officials are pushing for the Senate to pass this amendment. They have written op-eds, called their representatives, and worked to inform the public about the need to take action now.

Michael Chertoff, who served as Secretary of Homeland Security under President George W. Bush, published a piece this month in the Wall Street Journal, calling on Congress to take action and pass the Klobuchar-Graham amendment. He noted that our amendment would address the cyber security challenge in a way that is ''fiscally responsible, respectful of states' policymaking powers, and proactive in dealing with the most pressing vulnerabilities.''

As I noted, Bruce Fein, a Reagan Department of Justice official, said: ''The amendment would enormously strengthen defenses against cyber-attacks that could compromise the integrity of elections in the United States and undermine legitimacy of government.''

A bipartisan group of former national security officials sent a letter to Senate leadership pushing for a vote on this amendment. They noted that attacks on U.S. voting systems threatened the most basic underpinnings of American self-government. These attacks are growing in sophistication and scale.

As we all know, States administer elections. If you talk to the local election officials—call any of them up—you will find that they are adamant about protecting States' rights in this area.

We want to help them. A bipartisan group of 10 Secretaries of State sent a letter urging the Senate to pass this amendment. They want this amendment to pass because it would provide vital resources.

How do you truly expect someone in a town of 1,000 people to be up on the latest cyber security attacks from some sophisticated hackers in a warehouse in Russia? Really? I don't think so. That is why we want to keep the decentralized nature of our elections. In some ways, one, we like it; two, it gives us protection because it is not all in one system. We know we have to realize that in these small towns and in these rural areas, they are not going to have the updated, sophisticated cyber security protection equipment unless we tell them how they can do it and give them help to get there.

The National Association of Counties, a group that unites America's 3,069 counties, also endorses this amendment. Why? Because in our country, most of our elections are run by county officials.

As I noted, our decentralized system is both a strength and a weakness—a strength because we have multiple systems, so all of our information isn't in one place. American elections are increasingly an easy target because many local election systems are using election technology that is completely outdated.

A survey of 274 election administrators in 28 States found that most said their systems need upgrades. Forty-three States rely on electronic voting or tabulation systems that are at least 10 years old. Whoa. Do you think the Russians and those other foreign entities that want to mess up with our democracy are not aware that this equipment is 10 years old? I am not telling them anything new right now. Of course they are aware of it.

What are we doing? We are letting people in these small towns in Alaska or in Iowa sit there and wait to see if it happens. Guess what. If they get into one locality or if they get into one State, do you think that doesn't undermine the integrity of our whole democracy in our country? Of course it does.

Local election officials who are passionate about keeping the Federal Government out of State elections support our amendment because it strikes the balance that our Federal system demands when it comes to the administration of elections.

As I said, despite the strong bipartisan support for this amendment—the strong support and leadership of the Freedom Caucus—there are Members of this body who are still blocking a vote. They happen not to be on my side of the aisle, so I implore my friends the other side of the aisle to figure this out and let this either be included in the managers' package or come up for a vote where I know it would pass.

Republican and Democratic Senators support this amendment. Cyber security experts support this amendment. Republican and Democratic former national security officials support this amendment. State and local officials support this amendment.

I ask you, why is this not included? We don't have an answer. Actually, there is no good answer, except for a bunch of procedural gobbledygook, which, of course, if it had gone through the regular order and had been allowed a hearing—which it was not—then we would have had a hearing. We were blocked from having a hearing. Now, as is my right, I am bringing this before this body.

The integrity of our election system is the cornerstone of our democracy. The freedom to choose our leaders and know with full confidence those leaders were chosen in free and fair elections—that is something Americans have fought and died for since our country was founded.

Obstructing efforts to improve election security is an insult to everyone who has fought for freedom and those who work every day to protect our democracy. Members standing in the way of this bipartisan amendment to protect our election infrastructure are literally committing democracy malpractice.

Our attitude must be to roll up our sleeves to get this done. The American people deserve nothing less.

I see my friend Senator MCCAIN is on the floor. Again, I appreciate his support and his and Senator REED's work, not only on this bill but their work to try to include this amendment in the package.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota. She has been an advocate on this issue for a number of years. Obviously, as she stated with some articulation, we are talking about the fundamental of democracy, and the threat to it has probably never been greater.

She also understands there is an issue of germaneness and committees of responsibility and all that, but I want to tell the Senator from Minnesota that I appreciate her advocacy. This issue is not going away. I look forward to continuing to work with her because this is really—it may be in some ways one of the greatest threats to democracy we have faced, and I know she has been an advocate on this issue for a number of years. I thank her.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators PORTMAN and WARNER be added as cosponsors to the Reed amendment No. 939, relating to a strategy for countering malign Russian influence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to turn to discuss my amendment to counter malign Russian influence.

Amendment No. 939, sponsored by Senators MCCAIN, PORTMAN, CARDIN, BROWN, WARNER, WHITEHOUSE, DURBIN, and myself, would advance U.S. national security interests by requiring the President to submit to Congress a strategy for countering the threat of Russia's influence activities intended to undermine democracy in the United States, Europe, and across the world and to disrupt the global international order.

The amendment would require the President to provide Congress a strategy that is comprehensive, using every tool at our disposal to counter Russia's malign activities. The strategy would direct actions across the whole of government, including the following areas: security measures, the strategy would include actions to counter Russian hybrid warfare operations, building the capabilities of allies and partners to identify, attribute, and respond to Russian malign activities, short of conflict, and supporting the NATO alliance

and other security partnerships against Russian aggression; on information operations—the strategy would seek to counter Russia's use of disinformation and propaganda in social media as well as traditional media and to strengthen interagency mechanisms for coordinating and effectively implementing a whole-of-government response to Russian active measures; in the area of cyber, the strategy would require steps to defend against, deter, and when necessary respond to malicious cyber activities by the Kremlin, including the use of offensive cyber capabilities consistent with policies specified elsewhere in the act; in the political and diplomatic arenas, the strategy would be required to set out actions to enhance the resilience of U.S. democratic institutions and infrastructure and to work with countries vulnerable to malign Russian influence to promote good governance and strengthen democracy abroad; in the area of financial measures, the strategy would address the corrupt and illicit Russian financial networks in the United States and abroad that have facilitated and Russia's malign influence; and finally, on energy security, the strategy would include steps to promote the energy security of our European allies and partners, reducing Russia's ability to use energy dependence as a weapon of coercion or influence.

The amendment would also require that the administration's strategy be consistent with prior legislation relating to Russia's malign activities, including the Russian Sanctions Act that recently passed with overwhelming support in Congress; the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014, and the Magnitsky Act of 2012. This amendment would fill an important gap in our current approach to relations with Russia. To date, the Trump administration has been unwilling, for whatever reason, to articulate and implement an appropriate response to the threat to our democratic institutions and security posed by Russia's malign influence activities. This amendment would address this critical national security requirement.

It is both appropriate and critically important that this requirement for a strategy to counter Russian malign influence be amended to the National Defense Authorization Act because ultimately this is fundamentally an issue of national security. The administration's failure to acknowledge the insidious interference by Vladimir Putin and his cronies for what it really is—an attack by a foreign adversary on Western democracies and the institutions underpinning the global order—has real implications to our national security. The administration's lack of action to counter this malign influence only encourages the Kremlin to continue its aggression against the United States and its allies and partners.

The Russians know they cannot win in a conventional war, so they have adapted their tactics asymmetrically to leverage their strengths. These tactics pose a real threat, and we need to appropriately posture ourselves, using all tools of statecraft, to counter Russian malign influence.

Before President Obama left office, he ordered an intelligence review of Russian interference in U.S. elections.

On January 6, the U.S. intelligence community released a report on its findings on Russian interference in our democracy. This report included the consensus view of all 17 intelligence agencies, including the CIA, the National Security Agency, the FBI, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. Among the key findings were President Putin ''ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election''; ''Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency''; ''Russia's influence campaign was multifaceted, combining old-fashion Russian propaganda techniques with cyber espionage against U.S. political organizations and mass disclosure of government and private data:; ''Russian intelligence obtained and maintained access to elements of multiple US state or local electoral boards''; and ''Russia's state-run propaganda machine contributed to the influence campaign by serving as a platform for Kremlin messaging to Russian and international audiences.''

These findings were made public on January 6—over 8 months ago—with the additional warning from our intelligence experts that ''Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the US presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against US allies and their election processes.''

Furthermore, with each passing week more evidence comes to light about the depths to which the Kremlin went to interfere with our democracy.

Just last week, we learned that a Kremlin-linked troll factory bought $100,000 worth of Facebook ads which were further disseminated through bot networks as part of Russia's attempt to influence our 2016 Presidential election. The ads traced back to 470 fake accounts and pages on Facebook and mostly focused on pushing politically divisive issues such as gun rights, immigration, LBGT rights, and racial discrimination. Further reporting by the New York Times laid out in lurid detail how these fake accounts amplified other tactics of Russian malign influence and ginned up web traffic to DCLeaks—the site where Russian military intelligence first posted hacked emails.

The New York Times also reported that hundreds or thousands of fake Twitter accounts regularly posted anti-Clinton messages and used Twitter to draw attention to hacked materials during last year's campaign. Cybersecurity firm Fireye concluded that many of these Twitter accounts were associated with one another and linked back to Russian military intelligence.

This is just one tactic of influence that Russia is using as part of the wide ranging campaign it is waging against us.

Again and again, Russia has used the range of coercive tools at its disposal—including political pressure; economic manipulation; collaboration with corrupt local networks; propaganda, deception and denials; and, increasingly, military force—to try to intimidate democratic countries and undermine the further integration of NATO, the European Union, and other Western institutions.

It is clear that we need a strategy and we need it soon; yet what is surprising and disturbing is that the White House has failed to direct that a plan be developed to counter this Russian malign threat and to prepare our country for renewed Russian interference in the upcoming 2018 and 2020 elections. Time is running out.

We are now 8 months into the Trump administration.

During this time, numerous administration officials have publicly reinforced the findings of the intelligence community's January assessment of the threat posed by Russia's malign influence activities.

On May 11, Director of Central Intelligence Mike Pompeo said he hoped that we learn from Russian activity in the 2016 election and be able to more effectively defeat it.

On May 14, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said, ''I don't think there's any question that the Russians were playing around in our electoral processes.''

On May 23, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats stated, ''There clearly is a consensus that Russia has meddled in our election process . . . Russia's always been doing these kind of things with influence campaigns but they're doing it much more sophisticated through the use of cyber and other techniques than they did before.''

On June 13, Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis stated, ''We're recognizing the strategic threat that Russia is provided by its misbehavior.''

On July 9, 2017, U.N. Ambassador Nikki Haley stated, ''Everybody knows that [the Russians] are not just meddling in the United States' election. They're doing this across multiple continents, and they're doing this in a way that they're trying to cause chaos within the countries.''

On August 5, National Security Adviser H.R. McMaster described the threat from Russia ''as a very sophisticated campaign of subversion and disinformation and—and propaganda that is ongoing every day in an effort to break apart Europe and to pit political groups against each other to sow dissension . . . and conspiracy theories.''

Yet, despite the assessment from the intelligence community and these acknowledgements from the President's

own national security team that Russian malign influence and interference in our 2016 election and the elections of our close allies in Europe pose a national security threat, the President has yet to direct that actions be taken to counter Russian malign influence. As far as we know, the Oval Office has not ordered the national security team even to formulate a strategy to address these pressing threats from Putin and his cronies. Time is running out.

In fact, 8 months in, and despite the assessments of his Cabinet, the President can't even clearly admit that the threat is coming from Russia.

On January 11, President Trump stated, ''As far as hacking, I think it was Russia. But I think we also get hacked by other countries and other people.''

On April 30, President Trump said, ''It's very hard to say who did the hacking . . . I'll go along with Russia. Could've been China, could've been a lot of different groups.''

On May 11, President Trump said, ''If Russia or anybody else is trying to interfere with our elections, I think it's a horrible thing and I want to get to the bottom of it.''

On July 6, just prior to his meeting with President Putin, President Trump said, ''It could have very well been Russia but it could well have been other countries and I won't be specific but I think a lot of people interfered. Nobody really knows. Nobody really knows for sure.''

Let's stop and think about that for a minute. ''No one really knows for sure''? That this is even a question runs completely counter to the informed assessments of the entire intelligence community and the President's own national security team. It is time President Trump admits what the rest of us know to be true.

We also know, from multiple administration officials' testimony to Congress, that the President has not directed his Cabinet or senior staff to work on a strategy.

On May 11, when our colleague and vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee Senator WARNER asked DNI Coats where we stand in terms of preparation against a future Russian attack, he couldn't think of a single thing. He replied, ''Relative to a grand [Russia] strategy, I am not aware right now of any—I think we're still assessing the impact.''

On June 8, when our colleague Senator HEINRICH asked whether the President had inquired about what the FBI Director, our government, or the intelligence community should be doing to protect America against Russian interference in our election system, former FBI director James Comey stated, ''I don't recall a conversation like that.''

When I asked Defense Secretary Mattis on June 13 whether the President had directed him to begin intensive planning to protect our electoral system against the next Russian cyber attack, he was not able to point to any guidance indicating that the President recognizes the urgency of the Russian threat or the necessity of preparing to counter it next year during the midterm elections.

On June 21, officials from the Department of Homeland Security testified that 21 States were potentially targeted by Russian Government linked hackers in advance of the 2016 Presidential election. When I asked these officials whether the President had directed them to come up with a plan to protect our critical elections infrastructure, they also responded no.

On June 28, Representative SHERMAN asked U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Nikki Haley whether she had even talked to the President about Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election. She replied that she had not talked to the President about the subject.

On July 7, in a press conference at the G–8 summit after the President's meeting with President Putin, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson stated, ''I think the relationship [with Russia]—and the President made this clear as well—is too important, and it's too important not to find a way to move forward.''

It is long past the point where anyone can deny that Russia interfered in our election and the elections of our allies and partners in Europe. This should have been a priority on day 1.

We need to formulate a strategy and take action across the whole of government to counter the threat from Russia.

We cannot just ignore this problem or sweep Kremlin attacks on our elections and those of our close European allies under the rug and move forward. We need a strategy to counter Russian malign influence that leverages all our tools of power across the government.

Though President Trump may be unwilling to confront or condemn Russian interference in our democracy, we in Congress have been willing and able to take a stand to put pressure on Russia and push back against Russian malign influence.

As you are all aware, we took an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 98–2 this summer and passed long-overdue Russian sanctions. That was an important first step, but more must be done. We must act because the Trump administration has refused.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Members from both sides of the aisle in sponsoring this amendment. As former FBI director James Comey said when he testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee, ''It's not a Republican thing or Democratic thing. It really is an American thing. They're going to come for whatever party they choose to try and work on behalf of . . . They're just about their own advantage. And they will be back.''

This amendment will ensure the administration does take appropriate action. It will direct the President to formulate a comprehensive strategy to ensure that, when Putin and his minions come back in 2018 and 2020, we will have appropriate measures in place to detect, deter, and counter this serious threat to our democracy.

I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of this important and necessary amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, throughout my time as a Senator, I have heard our Service Chiefs testify time and again to the hollowing of America's military as a result of insufficient and unpredictable funding. Simultaneously, external dangers have grown in size and scope.

Sadly, for the first time in decades, we are forced to confront not one but multiple existential threats to the American way of life. An expressive Russia, expanding China, nuclear North Korea, nefarious Iran, and relentless global terror networks put our lives and the lives of future generations at risk.

America is once again in crisis. Inaction, obstruction, or partial commitment are not options. This year's National Defense Authorization Act provides us an opportunity to fulfill our duty—to provide America's soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and guardsmen the tools they need to accomplish all we demand.

I find it particularly fitting that this bill came to the floor the week of September 11, an anniversary of unparalleled adversity but also one of national unity. On that day, and the days that followed 16 years ago, the best of America eclipsed the evil of terror. We came together for the sake of our security, demonstrating to the world America's resilience.

There is no greater symbol of that resilience than those who serve in uniform. Secretary Mattis reminded us of that on Monday when he said: ''The men and women of America's armed forces have signed a blank check to protect the American people and to defend the constitution, a check payable with their lives.''

The least the Senate can do in return is authorize and prioritize congressional efforts to keep faith with that promise. At the same time, we are under no obligation to fund overbudget, behind-timeline defense programs with a blank check of their own. To the contrary, we have an oversight obligation to the American taxpayers, those in and out of uniform, to ensure proper stewardship of their hard-earned dollars.

That is why I, along with my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, crafted and passed unanimously the bill before you. In it, we have prescribed a clear and comprehensive plan to rebuild our military to decisively deter or defeat any adversary. However, we are also holding the Department accountable for each dollar it spends.

For my part, as a member of the Armed Services Committee and chair

of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, I focused on three priorities.

First, I supported our troops and their families by making senior enlisted pay scales commensurate with job requirements, by combating sexual assault and retaliation, and by facilitating Federal direct hiring authority for military spouses. I extended that support to the battlefield by promoting enhanced standards for things like parachutes, aircraft life support systems, and counterdrone technologies.

Second, I advanced policy initiatives to increase cooperation with international partners, to codify a more comprehensive counterterror strategy, and to reaffirm America's support for our European friends by putting Russia on notice for its aggression in Ukraine and Crimea.

Finally, I included measures to optimize existing institutions, such as our National Guard's cyber capabilities, and to ease regulatory burdens, so the best ideas and products from our universities and private companies can bolster national security at a lower cost. I have led important efforts to hold DOD accountable by requiring enhanced program management standards and by joining Senators GRASSLEY and PERDUE in demanding that the Department finally meet its 26-year overdue statutory obligation to complete a clean audit.

Colleagues, let's be clear—no one wants America's military to be our first or only option, but we must also acknowledge this truth: It is fundamental to our security that a ready military remains an option. The fiscal year 2018 NDAA is a vital step toward providing that security. Seeing it through to fruition as part of a larger effort to reassert our ''power of the purse'' is the next step. There will be time to debate nondefense policies and budgets later, and as legislators, our job is to have these very debates.

Let's take the first step now. I urge all of my colleagues to support the NDAA. Follow through in the months ahead. Fulfill our obligation to realize its goal. We can do no less.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, each year the Department of Defense funds billions of dollars in military-relevant medical research—research that offers our servicemembers concrete treatments for the particular diseases and afflictions that impact them the most, research that offers families hope, research that improves lives, and research that saves lives.

Last summer, during consideration of the fiscal year 2017 Defense Authorization Act, there was a question as to whether Congress would permit this lifesaving research to continue or whether instead we would wrap it up in so much redtape that it would basically go away.

I was proud that this Senate Chamber, on a bipartisan basis, voted resoundingly to continue medical research in the Department of Defense by a vote 66 to 32. It was an important, bipartisan vote, especially in a Senate where we have a difficult time finding common ground. When it came to medical research in the Department of Defense for members of the military and their families, we said unequivocally that we are committed to it on a bipartisan basis. I was proud to lead that fight, along with Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri, a Republican, to protect defense medical research. Altogether, 40 of my Republican and Democratic colleagues co sponsored our effort.

That vote was not just a vote for medical research, it was a vote for the men and women in the military and their families. The vote recognized that right now, we are closer than ever to finding cures for dreaded diseases like cancer; closer than ever to understanding how to delay the onset of neurological diseases like Alzheimer's and Parkinson's; closer than ever to developing a universal flu vaccine. That vote recognized that now is the time to be ramping up our investment in medical research, not scaling it back. The Senate spoke, but unfortunately it didn't end the debate.

This year, the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act now pending on the floor of the Senate repeats last year's research-killing provisions and, for inexplicable reasons, adds two more. Just like last year, these provisions in the bill pending on the floor of the Senate would effectively end the Department of Defense medical research program. Like last year, these provisions wrapped this research in more redtape than you could possibly explain. And we face the prospect for the second year in a row of the end of this critical, lifesaving medical research.

These provisions are dangerous, and by cutting medical research, they will cost lives—the lives of our military and their families. So I filed a bipartisan amendment, along with 53 additional cosponsors and my lead cosponsor, Senator ROY BLUNT, Republican of Missouri, to remove these provisions from this Defense authorization bill so that lifesaving research can continue.

The underlying Defense authorization bill has four provisions that, if enacted, will end the DOD's research.

The first provision, section 733, would require the Secretary of Defense to certify that each medical research grant awarded is ''designed to directly protect, enhance or restore the health and safety of members of the Armed Forces''—not veterans, not retirees, not the spouses of military members, not the children of military members.

To make matters worse, after the Secretary makes this certification in writing to the Armed Services Committee, the Defense Department is then required to wait 90 days before awarding the grant. It is not only redtape, it is built-in delay.

In my view, veterans, retirees, and spouses and children of servicemembers are all vital members of the Department of Defense's military community. They use the Department of Defense healthcare system. They deserve to be counted. When a member of the military deploys, the family deploys, and we ought to stand by all of them.

The second provision, section 891, requires that medical research grant applicants meet the same accounting and pricing standards that DOD requires of procurement contracts. That sounds simple enough, doesn't it? But these are regulations that private companies have to meet to sell the Department of Defense goods and services, like weapon systems and equipment.

The third provision, section 892, changes the ground rules for how to handle the technical data generated by this research—information related to clinical trials and manufacturing processes. How does this bill change it? This should sound familiar: by wiping away the existing regulations and imposing overly burdensome and unappealing regulations that would scare off research partners.

I am sympathetic to what this section may be attempting to do. In the face of ever-increasing prescription drug costs, it does make sense for the Federal Government to have more rights when it comes to products and treatments developed with Federal taxpayer dollars. However, we must be more strategic about how to approach this. I look forward to working across the aisle on ways to beef up the government's role in helping to keep drug costs down, especially for products that would not have been possible without Federal investments.

The fourth provision, section 893, requires the Defense Contract Audit Agency to conduct audits on each grant recipient.

For those who aren't familiar with this audit agency, it is currently backlogged with tens of billions of dollars' worth of procurement contracts that it has to audit. This provision in the bill would add to this pile, requiring it to conduct an additional 800 audits per month on medical research grants—more redtape; no real reason.

Taxpayers deserve to know how their money is being spent, and the existing system does that. The grant application must show that the research is relevant to the military. No grant makes it through the first round without showing clear military relevance. If an applicant fails this test, that is the end of the story. If they clear the hurdle, then they are subjected to a long list of critical defense researchers

and issue experts in the disease in question to ensure that their research proposal is worth the investment. But that is not it. Representatives from the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Veterans Affairs also have input at that point to make sure it doesn't duplicate any existing research. These rules are in place to protect taxpayer dollars, and they work.

This year's Defense authorization attempts to add redtape to the program in the name of protecting it but in reality ends it. Simply put, these provisions would strangle the Department of Defense medical research program in suffocating redtape. Don't take my word for it. The Coalition for National Security Research, representing a broad-based coalition of research universities and institutes, said:

> [These sections] could jeopardize funding for research activities that have broader relevance to U.S. military, including the health and wellbeing of military families and veterans, and the efficiency of the military healthcare system.

We asked the Department of Defense how the new system proposed in this bill would work. Here is their analysis:

> This language would, in essence, eliminate military family and military retiree relevant medical research, inhibit military medical training programs, and impact future health care cost avoidance. Impacts will take place across all areas. . . . [Researchers] would most likely not want to do business with the DOD. . . . [The provisions] may create a chilling effect on potential awardees of DOD assistance agreements.

A ''chilling effect'' on medical research—is that what we want to go on the record to vote for with this bill? Is that what the Senate wants? Is that what we want to say to members of the military, their families, and retirees? I don't think so.

These provisions are simply put in the bill to erect roadblocks to critical, important medical research.

Let's talk for a minute about the medical research funded by DOD, the real-world impact.

Since fiscal year 1992, the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs has invested almost $12 billion in innovative medical research. This medical research command determines the appropriate research strategy, filling research gaps, and creates a public-private partnership between the Federal Government, private universities, and those who desperately need this research.

In 2004, the Institute of Medicine, an independent organization, looked at the medical research program that I have discussed, and what did they find? ''The CDMRP has shown that it has been an efficiently managed and scientifically productive effort.'' That is a pretty solid endorsement of $12 billion worth of medical research. They found that this program ''concentrates its resources on research mechanisms that complement rather than duplicate the research approaches of major funders of medical research in the United States, such as the National Institutes of Health.'' They also found that ''the program appears to be well-run, supports high-quality research, and contributes to research progress.''

The Institute of Medicine also reviewed the program in 2016. This was their conclusion just last summer about the same program:

> CDMRP is a well-established medical research funding organization, covering many health conditions of concern to members of the military and veterans, their families, and the general public. . . . In general—

And this is highlighted—

> the committee found CDMRP processes for reviewing and selecting applications for funding to be effective in allocating funds for each research program.

This program has been closely vetted, as it should be. It is a matter of medical research critical to members of the military and their families. It is a matter of life and death. It is a matter of the integrity of spending taxpayers' dollars. It is a good program, a solid program. It has not been wrought with scandal. There is no reason for us to turn it upside down or to turn the lights out in the offices of these researchers.

The Institute of Medicine had this right. We have real results to back up the way we feel about this. What areas have they embarked on with critical successful research? One of the greatest success stories of this program is advances we have made in breast cancer treatment. In 1993, the Department of Defense awarded Dr. Dennis Slamon two grants totaling $1.7 million for a tumor tissue bank to study breast cancer. He began his work several years earlier with funding from the National Cancer Institute. The DOD kicked in to help.

Dr. Slamon's DOD-funded work helped to develop Herceptin, which is now FDA approved, one of the most widely used drugs to fight breast cancer. This research has not only saved the lives of countless women in the military, but it has had application far beyond the military. The same thing is true when it comes to prostate cancer and Parkinson's disease. What we found over and over is that money invested in this program for medical research is money well spent. Why, then, would we bury this program in redtape?

I am happy that some 54 or 55 Senators from both sides of the aisle are going to stand with me, and I see I have other colleagues preparing to speak. I will return to speak more specifically about the programs of this agency.

Is there a person in this country who believes that America is spending too much money on medical research? Well, perhaps there is, but I haven't met them. What I have found over and over is that Members of both political parties are committed to medical research. The Department of Defense does a great job with the resources given to them.

Let's continue this program as a salute to our men and women in the military, their families, and our veterans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, let me state the bottom line up front. This year's NDAA, once again, focuses medical research dollars on the needs of servicemembers and military veterans, and it increases transparency on how these taxpayer funds are being spent.

The amendment of the Senator from Illinois would take hundreds of millions of dollars away from defense needs to spend it on research activities totally unrelated to the mission of the military and shield these activities from critical oversight by the Department and the Congress.

Let me state this up front: If these medical research dollars were invested in the proper branch of government, I would be one of its strongest supporters. What we are seeing here—what we see so often—is the Willie Sutton syndrome. They asked Willie Sutton: Why do you rob banks? He said: That is where the money is.

Why do you think medical research for autism, spinal cord injury, prosthetics, or many others have nothing to do with defense? Let's take it out. Let's appropriate the right amount of money to the right branch of government. So while we are watching the defense dollars—thanks to sequestration—going down over the last 20 years, Congress has provided more than $11.7 billion in medical research.

According to—what is aptly named over in Defense—the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs, 12 out of 28 current research programs do not mention the military, combat, or servicemembers and their official mission or vision statements.

So let me repeat this for the benefit of my colleagues. Spending on medical research at the Department of Defense, nearly 15 percent of which has nothing to do with the military, has grown 4,000 percent since 1992—4,000 percent. So in the meantime, the Budget Control Act is constraining the DOD budget. It has done great harm to our military. Every single service chief and combatant commander over the last 5 years has testified to the Armed Services Committee that the budget caps imposed by BCA have hurt our military readiness and have made it more difficult to respond to the Nation's growing threats. Yet, during this time of severe defense budget restrictions, funding for the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs has nearly doubled. Is that our priority?

I suggest to the Senator from Illinois: Why don't you go to the right place in the appropriations bill and allocate research funds there? Why don't you do that? You are not going there because it is the Willie Sutton syndrome.

What you are doing is you are taking away from the men and women serving

in the military what they need to defend this Nation.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. No, I will not yield.

The fact is that we have now had a rash of fatal accidents in the military—10 from the USS *McCain* and 17 more. We now have many more accidents due to the lack of readiness, training, and maintenance than we do in combat. So what do we do? Do we stop cutting the military? No, we add $11.7 billion for medical research.

I am for medical research. I know of no one who opposes medical research, but do we take it out of defense? This is the directed spending on medical research at the Department of Defense.

You may see that in 1992 it was a small amount of money for breast cancer research. Like other government programs, it has grown and grown and grown. If you will take a look at the pink side here, you will see that what also has grown is those programs that have no relevance to the military. I want to say it one more time. No, I will say it again and again and again. If the Senator from Illinois wants this money spent for medical research, then, take it out of the right place. Don't be Willie Sutton. Take it from where it belongs, instead of taking it from the men and women in the military who are undermanned, undertrained, underequipped, and in harm's way.

So you have a choice here, my dear friends. Yes, who could be against medical research? Nobody who I know. But who could be in favor of taking money from the men and women and their training, equipment, and readiness, when every single service chief has testified before the Armed Services Committee that we are putting the lives of men and women serving in the military at greater risk? So we are going to see these billions of dollars taken out of defending the Nation and the arms, the training, and the equipment that the men and women in the military need.

Now, if the Senator from Illinois wants to fund those that are militarily relevant, I would be glad to go along with that, but see what has grown and grown and grown from 1992, when it was $25 million. Now it is billions of dollars. Let's see. Funding has increased by 4,000 percent from $25 million in 1992 to over $1 billion last year.

Spending on medical research—nearly 50 percent of which has nothing to do with the military—has grown 4,000 percent since 1992. So let's not say that we are shorting the men and women in the military when that spending has increased by 4,000 percent.

Again, I would like every one of my colleagues to listen to the leaders of our military and to the men and women who are serving. They don't have enough training. They don't have enough equipment. They are not ready, and it is being reflected in these kinds of accidents where we are killing more members of the military in training than we are in combat, and every one of the service chiefs will tell you that it is because of lack of funding for training and readiness and maintenance. This has to stop.

The NDAA this year prohibits the Secretary of Defense and the service Secretaries from funding or conducting a medical research and development project unless they certify that the project would protect, enhance, or restore the health and safety of members of the Armed Forces. Is that an outrageous requirement that we should spend tax dollars that are for defense that would actually be used for defense? Wouldn't that be outrageous?

So it requires that medical research projects are open to competition and comply with other DOD, or Department of Defense, cost accounting standards. So we are not only asking them to be responsible but to comply with other Department of Defense cost accounting standards. So why that should be unacceptable, I don't know.

So the Senator from Illinois has submitted an amendment that would strike these requirements—it would strike these requirements—to adhere to the Department of Defense cost accounting standards. Why? Why would you not want to go along with cost accounting standards?

So it is certainly not an accident that the largest spike in congressionally directed medical research funding coincides with the tenure of the Senator from Illinois as chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee Defense Subcommittee, in which, I say, he has done an outstanding job. Hundreds of millions of dollars in the defense budget will be used for medical research unrelated to defense, and it was not requested by the administration.

If this amendment passes, hundreds of millions of dollars will be taken away from military servicemembers and their families. If this amendment passes, hundreds of millions of dollars will not be used to provide a full 2.1-percent pay raise for our troops. It will not be used to build up the size of our Army and Marine Corps. It will not be used to buy equipment so that our airmen don't have to steal spare parts of airplanes in the boneyard to keep the oldest, smallest, and least ready Air Force in our history in the air.

So I say to my friend and colleague from Illinois, it is not that he is wrong to support medical research. We all support medical research. It is that he has proposed the wrong amendment to support medical research. Instead of proposing to take away hundreds of millions of dollars from our military servicemembers, he should be proposing a way to begin the long overdue process of shifting nonmilitary medical research spending out of the Department of Defense and into the appropriate civilian departments and agencies of our government.

I want to emphasize again that this debate is not about the value of this medical research or whether Congress should support it. I, of all people, know the miracle of modern medicine and am grateful for all who support it, and I am sure every Senator understands the value of medical research to Americans suffering from these diseases and to the family and friends who care for them and to all those who know the pain and grief of losing a loved one. But I will repeat again that this research does not belong in the Department of Defense. It belongs in civilian departments and agencies of our government.

So I say to my colleagues that the National Defense Authorization Act focuses the Department's research efforts on medical research that will lead to lifesaving advancements in battlefield medicine and new therapies for recovery and rehabilitation of servicemembers wounded on the battlefield. This amendment would harm our national security. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois would harm our national security by reducing the funding available for militarily relevant medical research that helps protect servicemen and servicewomen on the battlefield and for military capabilities they desperately need to perform their missions. It would continue to put decision-making about medical research in the hands of lobbyists and politicians, instead of medical experts where it belongs.

I would like to repeat for at least the fifth time that I strongly support funding for medical research. I do not support funding for medical research that has nothing to do with the Department of Defense. The dollars are too scarce. You can see the way that it has gone up and up and up. So what we are trying to do is to preserve medical research where it applies to the Department of Defense and not use it for every other program, which should be funded by other agencies of government. I am very aware of the power and influence of the lobbyists who lobby for this kind of money, knowing full well that this is the easiest place to get the money.

I just hope that some of us would understand that 10 sailors just died onboard the USS *John S. McCain*. They died because that ship was not ready, not trained, not equipped, and not capable of doing its job because they didn't have enough funding. Let's get our priorities straight.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. I object.

Go ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois be recognized for up to 2 minutes and then, following that, that I be recognized, and then, following that, Senator GILLIBRAND.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I object. I was next in line.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I believe I am recognized and have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the men and women of our military defend us on a daily basis without a doubt, but now, today, is our time to do the same for them.

One thing I cannot defend is how we continue to tie our own hands when it comes to funding the U.S. military.

This week we are considering, of course, the Defense Authorization Act that will help ensure that our military has the resources it needs to achieve the mission of today and rise to the challenges of tomorrow, but there is a fundamental problem with the way we equip the men and women we task with defending us. It is called sequestration. The sequester was called for by the Budget Control Act, which puts annual caps on defense and nondefense discretionary spending, and enforces those caps with a kind of budget cleaver. In other words, any spending that exceeds the caps automatically gets axed.

That sounds like a good idea in the abstract. Who doesn't want to treat our addiction to spending? Who doesn't want to put the Federal Government on a diet? I certainly do, but I am not willing to sacrifice our national security and the No. 1 priority of the Federal Government when it comes to providing for our mutual defense. In the words of the junior Senator from Arkansas, himself a veteran, he said: ''Rather than attack America's spending problem at its root, the law only clipped a few stray leaves off the branches.''

If we are going to be serious about reducing our deficit, we must address our budget priorities by looking at and addressing all government spending, not just the 30 percent or so that is discretionary. The reason we are not serious about dealing with our looming deficits and debt is not because of defense spending, it is because of mandatory entitlement spending, which is the political third rail of our government, and politicians are so afraid to deal with that mandatory spending that we cut defense spending into the muscle, to the bone, and it leads to the sort of dangers the Senator from Arizona talked about, in terms of a lack of readiness and training.

The caps in sequester, mind you, do not represent any defense policy; instead, they were driven by our failure to get serious about the real budget threat: explosive growth in government-funded entitlement programs. Appropriated necessary funding for our Armed Forces should not be held hostage because of our inability to tighten our belts in other areas where the real runaway growth has occurred. It is past time to annually pass appropriations to fund the Department of Defense. It is past time to objectively assess and fund the actual and ever-changing defense needs of our country.

What are the results of the Budget Control Act? Well, we are not really saving money, but we are wasting time. We repeatedly raise the Budget Control Act's budget caps at the last minute, meaning they really don't keep spending down. Meanwhile, our military's ability to plan and forecast is severely hampered. When you can't plan, you are not ready, and it is no exaggeration to say that we now find ourselves in a true state of a readiness crisis. Our military, already under great stress and stretched thin around the world, has suffered from 15 years of continued operations, budgetary restrictions, and deferred investment.

According to General Walters, the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, more than half of the Marines' fixed- and rotary-winged aircraft were unable to fly at the end of 2016—more than half of the Marines' fixed- and rotary-winged aircraft were unable to fly at the end of 2016. That is outrageous. The Navy fleet currently stands at 277 of the 350-ship requirement.

The Air Force had 134 fighter squadrons in 1991, when we drove Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. Now it has only 55—in 2017, 55, and in 1991, 134, and we have 1,500 fewer fighter pilots than we need.

Heather Wilson, Secretary of the Air Force, put it earlier this week, when she said, ''We have been doing too much with too little for too long.'' We need to hear these words, and we need to remember how they spell out in the real world—how they affect our sailors, our pilots, and our troops on the ground.

This summer, the Nation mourned 42 servicemembers who died in accidents related to readiness challenges. Mr. MCCAIN, the Senator from Arizona, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, pointed out the death of 17 sailors aboard the USS *John S. McCain* and USS *Fitzgerald* alone, plus other separate actions claimed the lives of 19 marines and 6 soldiers.

Meanwhile, the world has not become a safer, more peaceful place. We keep trying to cash that peace dividend, but there is no peace. In fact, when our adversaries see us retreating from our commitment to fund, equip, and train our military, it is a provocation. They see an opportunity, whether it is Vladimir Putin in Crimea, Ukraine, or China in the South China Sea, or Kim Jong Un in North Korea, they see our retreat, in terms of our financial commitment to support and train our military, as a provocation and an invitation for them to fill the void.

I am reminded of a sobering quote from the former Director of National Intelligence during a hearing last year. Former Director James Clapper said: ''In my time in the intelligence business''—and he served for 50 years in the intelligence business—''I don't recall a time when we have been confronted with a more diverse array of threats.''

In 50 years, he didn't recall us being confronted with a more diverse array of threats. On top of these threats, never before has our country been at war for such an extended period of time, and never before have we done so much with an All-Volunteer military force strained by repeated deployments while defense spending was cut nearly 15 percent over the last 8 years under the previous administration.

So here is what I say. Let's pass the national defense authorization bill, which authorizes $700 billion for our Nation's defense. Let's give our troops the pay raise they deserve. Let's address our readiness problems by authorizing increases in the overall number of soldiers and marines. When doing that, let's also do away with the sequester on defense spending. Reductions to defense spending should be targeted—think scalpel, not meat cleaver—and our focus on cutting should be where the bulk of our spending is: outside of the military on mandatory spending, growing at a rate in excess of 5 percent a year, out of control and threatening the solvency of these important safety net programs.

Colleagues, while we take the fight to ISIS, while we seek to deter aggression in the Pacific and support our emergency responders here at home, including the military, we can't postpone our problems. Our challenges can't be postponed and are not disappearing.

As I said a moment ago, our adversaries are watching closely and modernizing while at home our readiness wavers. Sequestration causes our aircraft to age, our soldiers to tire, and our national security to deteriorate. Trouble is not going to wait on us getting our act together. Whether our military is ready or not, here it comes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. 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. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank the leaders of the Armed Services Committee. I know the Presiding Officer serves on that committee so he is well aware of the extraordinary work and service done by Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED and our colleagues on the committee who have cooperated so collegially, in a bipartisan way, to produce a defense bill that supports our military men and women and their families and, more importantly, supports the United States of America in continuing to be the greatest and strongest power ever on the planet.

I want to talk about some of the specifics of that measure but first want to honor the 17 sailors who perished on the USS *McCain* and USS *Fitzgerald*. Two of them were sailors from Connecticut, and I want to pay tribute to ET2 Dustin Doyon of Suffield and ST2 Ngoc Truong Huynh of Watertown, CT. They were true patriots. Their families

should be proud of them. All of Connecticut celebrates their extraordinary service and sacrifice to our Nation, even as we are struck by the grief and share the sadness of their families as best we can.

I know we also feel we owe it to them, their families, and all families of the men and women in uniform to be safe. The investigation is proceeding into the circumstances surrounding the crash that caused their deaths. I will be interested, and I hope that investigation will be expedited.

The NDAA is a vital measure that preserves our national security in an uncertain era of unprecedented threats and delivers support necessary to sustain our servicemembers and our national defense. A number of the provisions I helped craft in this measure will improve opportunities for veterans, military sexual assault survivors, help with the Ukrainian soldiers, and extend the Afghan special immigrant visa program. Those measures, among others, I am proud to have participated in crafting and supporting.

This year's bill invests billions of dollars in submarines, helicopters, and the Joint Strike Fighter engine, all produced by Connecticut's highly skilled and dedicated workforce.

The bill includes over $8 billion for Virginia and Columbia class submarines, including over $1 billion above the President's request for Virginia funding and full funding for the Columbia class program following a successful amendment I led to secure our undersea superiority and grow Connecticut jobs. Nothing is more important to our national defense than our undersea superiority. The stealth, strength, and power of our submarine force is vital to our national security.

The measure also includes $25 million for undersea research and development partnerships which Electric Boat and the University of Connecticut are well poised to take part in.

This defense measure provides, as well, $10.6 billion for 94 Joint Strike Fighters across the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, adding 24 above the budget request submitted by the President. Those 24 are necessary, and they are important now.

It includes $1 billion for 48 Army Black Hawks, $1.3 billion for six Marine Corps CH–53Ks—two more than requested—and $354 million for the Air Force Combat Rescue Helicopter Program.

Today our Active and Reserve components are deployed together in Afghanistan, and the National Guard brings unique capabilities to the fight. I am very proud of the Connecticut National Guard. I am proud to be a supporter, to work to protect and secure their vital mission as they work for us.

This year's NDAA authorizes $7 million in military construction for a new base entry complex, bringing the 103rd Airlift Wing into compliance with the Department of Defense's antiterrorism and force protection requirements to support their C–130 mission.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. For these reasons and many others, this bill keeps faith with our military men and women. It secures our national defense. It provides the assurance going forward that we will remain as strong as we need to be as the world's only superpower, guaranteeing not only our own freedom but that of others around the world.

As we consider amendments on the floor, I urge my colleagues to reject the new BRAC proposal that was introduced by Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED as McCain amendment No. 933. With all due respect, I support the intent. Again, I thank them for all of their work on this bill, as it has been an extraordinary accomplishment to bring it this far and to, hopefully, within the next few days, get it over the finish line. The intent is good. Our military is capitalizing on future savings where they exist, and it must continue to do so. Base closings will be necessary, as that is a stark fact of life, but I cannot support the BRAC effort they have proposed.

The BRAC amendment would set in motion a long and time-consuming and convoluted base closure process. Connecticut is all too familiar with that process. We had a near-death experience with our base not all that long ago. It was an experience that should sound alarm bells not only for Connecticut but for other States my colleagues represent. As a Senator who represents one of the last military bases in New England, I am deeply concerned that there may be harm to civil-military relations and harm to our national security that will be caused by closing bases in our region.

The first obligation of Congress is to do no harm to these military bases. Connecticut has seen this process before. It took almost a decade for the Connecticut Air National Guard to be assigned the C–130 flying mission that was the outcome of the last BRAC round. To carry out this mission, the Connecticut Air National Guard began deploying in support of operations in the Middle East this year.

I know personally about that BRAC process. I was involved in the BRAC Commission proceedings, and afterward I was involved in literally suing the Secretary of Defense to preserve the flying mission of our base at the Air National Guard in Connecticut. Closing that base to the Air National Guard, to the C–130, or to other planes like it would have been a disgraceful outcome, but we succeeded in reaching a result, through settlement, that preserved it.

The submarine capital of the world, also known as the ''First and Finest Submarine Base,'' is in Connecticut. The fate of that base, the Naval Submarine Base of New London, was unnecessarily put in jeopardy in 2005 as it endured unnecessary questions over its viability and military value that delayed investments and the homeporting of submarines there. Given the importance and prominence of our submarine fleet today, as well as the $17 million since 2005 that the State has invested in this base—$17 million invested by the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut—it is inconceivable that we would close this asset. It is home to 16 submarines as well as to a submarine training school.

BRAC is long on unrealized returns and short on increased readiness. In 2005, BRAC was anticipated to cost $21 billion and save over $35 billion in the next 20 years. In reality, costs have ballooned to $35 billion, and savings will be less than one-third of what was initially projected—just $10 billion. That is the 2005 BRAC verdict; that it costs more than it saves. Simply put, BRAC cuts capabilities, and we can never get those capabilities back. At a time of global uncertainty and an expanding threat environment, we should be investing more, not less, in our readiness.

As a first step, I would welcome an independent study on where excess capacity exists today, but I am concerned that this amendment sets into motion a BRAC authorization before Congress is provided with the justification for doing so and where and how it should be set in motion. I am concerned this amendment employs a force structure baseline that has not been adequately assessed by the Department of Defense. That force structure baseline is the lifeblood of our future military, and moving forward without it provides a distorted view of where excess capacity may exist.

The BRAC amendment eliminates the independent commission that was previously designed by Congress in an effort to take politics out of the process. I deeply respect my colleagues who support this measure, but I have no confidence that they will be able to set aside the impact closures will have on their individual States. Let's be very blunt. This measure will exacerbate the role of politics in this process, not diminish it.

While an independent commission is by no measure completely above politics, removing it will aggravate the roles that parochialism and politics play in deciding the future of military installations. Under the rules of the Senate, this body stripped itself of the ability to even make requests for individual military construction projects at specific bases. It follows that deciding the fate of entire military bases should also be a power we keep from ourselves.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, for our own sake, as Members of a body that should support our national defense, keep it as free as possible from politics and parochialism, and make sure we insulate it as much as possible from the currents and forces of special interests. I admire and respect the time and effort our committee leaders have devoted to this amendment. If it is defeated, I will

work with them to address the issues I have outlined. Base closing must be considered. There are bases that can and should be reduced and perhaps completely eliminated, but I cannot support the BRAC amendment before us, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Again, I thank the chairman of the committee, Senator MCCAIN, and the ranking member, Senator REED, for all of their great work on this very important measure, which I hope will be passed shortly.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, this week, we are debating the National Defense Authorization Act of 2018. It is very important, and Members of both sides have contributed to this very important legislation we pass every year. It funds our military and authorizes its spending and training. It is really one of the most important things we do in the Senate.

As have many others, I thank the members of the Armed Services Committee. I have the privilege of serving on that committee. I thank Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED for the hard work they and all of the members of the committee have put into this and for how seriously we take this responsibility.

You have heard the discussions. This bill is needed now more than ever. We are seeing accidents, in terms of training, that are killing the lives of young men and women who are serving in the military, and a lot of it is due to readiness. In fact, in the past 8 years, the U.S. military has seen its budget decline by almost 25 percent. It is a huge decrease—just pick up the paper and see what is going on in the world—when we know that the national security threats to the United States have dramatically increased. We have decreasing budgets and increasing national security challenges, and this NDAA begins the much needed process of changing that.

I would like to focus on one such threat that we need to address right now that is at the doorstep of our great Nation and what the NDAA is doing specifically about that threat. The threat is North Korea's nuclear intercontinental ballistic activity and capability. As the Presiding Officer knows, that has now literally become a threat to every city in the United States, not just to frontline States like mine, which is the great State of Alaska, or Hawaii, as they are closer to Asia than is any other place in the United States. This threat is now on the doorstep of every American city.

For years, a lot of the ''experts'' and intel officials were saying: Hey, don't worry about this. They are trying, but this threat is a long way off into the future.

Some of us were skeptical of those estimates, and now we know those estimates were wrong. It is no longer a matter of ''if'' but ''when'' the North Korean regime will have the capability of launching a nuclear intercontinental ballistic missile that will be aimed at the United States of America.

Recently, there was a disturbing article written in the Washington Post, the lead paragraph of which reads:

> North Korea will be able to field a reliable, nuclear-capable intercontinental ballistic missile as early as next year, U.S. officials have concluded in a confidential assessment, that dramatically shrinks the timeline for when Pyongyang could strike North American cities with atomic weapons.

This assessment was leaked by someone within the Pentagon's Defense Intelligence Agency, and it shaves almost 2 full years off of what we thought North Korea's capability was. Right now, the threat is here. Think about this threat with regard to who is leading North Korea—an unstable dictator who has shown that he is not rational.

Let me go into a little bit more of the threat here. When you look at the different regimes—Kim Il Sung, Kim Jong Il, and Kim Jong Un, who is the current dictator of North Korea—in just the 5 years since he has come to power, he has conducted more than 80 missile tests and over twice as many nuclear tests as both his father and grandfather did in their 60 years of ruling North Korea. Look at this chart. It shows missile tests, nuclear tests—5 years—way more than his father and grandfather ever did.

And while several of these missile tests have been failures, we have obviously seen clear successes. In fact, while many Americans were celebrating the Fourth of July holiday—our patriotism, our liberty, our military—Kim Jong Un launched a successful test of an intercontinental ballistic missile.

On the nuclear side, we have seen activity even more recently, allegedly a test of a hydrogen bomb with an estimated yield of 120 kilotons—their third nuclear test since January 2016. It was eight times more powerful than their last test.

The bottom line with regard to this threat from a very unstable regime is they are making very significant progress.

So that is the threat. It is very real—on our shores—led by an unstable dictator who has threatened to use these weapons.

What are we doing about it? Well, we have the capability to defend against this threat, and that capability is through much more enhanced missile defense for the homeland of the United States—for our cities. That is what this National Defense Authorization Act does.

Unfortunately, over the past several years, the Federal Government has not taken homeland missile defense very seriously. One study recently found that in its history, our homeland missile defense has been characterized by a ''trend of high ambition followed by increasing modesty.''

The ''high ambition'' has been largely driven by the threats to our Nation, but the modesty component has been largely a function of decreasing budgets for the Missile Defense Agency. In fact, from 2006 to 2016, the Missile Defense Agency's budget has declined nearly 25 percent. Homeland missile defense testing has declined by nearly 83 percent. So when our adversaries are testing and advancing, we have been going in the opposite direction.

I am glad to say that this year's NDAA reverses this long-term trend of homeland missile defense neglect.

Earlier this year, with a number of my colleagues in this body, we introduced the Advancing America's Missile Defense Act of 2017. This is a bill that we worked on for months, with experts in missile defense, the military experts, the civilian experts, to say: What do we need to better protect the United States of America? What are the key elements? We put this together in a bill that we introduced several months ago, focusing on the following key areas:

First, the Advancing America's Missile Defense Act would dramatically increase our capacity for what are called our ground-based missile interceptors—up to 28 more interceptors—and require our military to look at fielding 100 more—up to 100 missile interceptors—to fully protect the United States.

Second, our bill would advance the technology to not only have more ground-based missile interceptors but the kill vehicles on top of those missiles—the bullets from which the missiles could shoot additional warheads. This is technology that is advancing, but it needs to advance much more quickly.

Third, our bill looks at integrating the different missile defense systems throughout the world. So in theater, for example, in South Korea, we have the THAAD system, and we have that on Guam. We have Aegis systems with our Navy ships, and then we have our ground-based system back home, in the homeland of the United States. Our bill looks at integrating these systems with a space-based sensor, to have an unblinking eye, in terms of the technology, that can track and shoot down missiles coming to the United States and integrate with regional defenses and our homeland defenses.

Fourth, our bill focuses on more testing for missile defense.

As I mentioned, the decline of the testing has inhibited the development of these systems. It focuses on the testing but also doing the testing with our allies that are also advancing missile defense in different areas of the world.

As I mentioned, we worked on this bill for months. One of the key elements I am most proud of in this bill is the strong bipartisan support it has received in the Senate and in the House. Importantly, when we introduced it as part of the NDAA markup, we had over one-quarter of all of the Members of the U.S. Senate who were already cosponsors—Democrats and Republicans

from literally every region of the United States.

This is a first and important development in a long time with regard to missile defense. Unfortunately, for years, that has been viewed as a partisan issue, not a bipartisan issue. And what we were trying to do as we developed this bill was to say this shouldn't be partisan. This is a threat that every city in America is going to have to deal with. Let's work together and get a bipartisan bill together.

I was proud when the Wall Street Journal editorial wrote about this bill and emphasized that bipartisan nature. A few months ago they wrote:

> [The Advancing America's Missile Defense Act] has united conservatives such as Ted Cruz and Marco Rubio and liberal Democrats such as Gary Peters and Brian Schatz, no small feat in the Trump era. . . . Mr. Sullivan's missile-defense amendment would be a down payment on a safer America in an ever more dangerous world.

Why did they write this? Because they understand the importance of having bipartisan support for missile defense but also the importance of making sure that Congress leads on this important issue. Thankfully, that is what the NDAA does this year—both versions—the Senate version and the House version.

The vast majority of our bill that we introduced we debated in the markup for the NDAA this year. Again, I thank Senators MCCAIN and REED and other members of the committee for the way in which the broader NDAA came together. But we debated this bill, and the vast majority of our bill on advancing America's missile defense is now in this NDAA—one of the many reasons I am encouraging all of my colleagues in the Senate to vote to pass it.

Something else that I think is important for my constituents to know but also for all Americans to know is the role that Alaska plays in America's missile defense. For those of my colleagues who sit on the Armed Services Committee, they have heard me say this many, many times. There is a famous quote in congressional testimony back in the 1930s by the father of the Air Force, Gen. Billy Mitchell. His quote in front of Congress was: Alaska is the most strategic place in the world because of its location on the top of the world. Whoever owns Alaska literally controls the world.

Fortunately, the United States owns Alaska. So we are, because of that strategic location, the cornerstone of our Nation's missile defense. If there were a missile launched from North Korea or Iran or anywhere else in the world, the trajectory would take it over Alaska. It would be tracked by radars in Alaska. It would be shot down by missiles based in Alaska. The 49th Missile Defense Battalion located at Fort Greely, AK, is a National Guard unit. They have a fantastic motto: 300 protecting the 300 million—young men and women serving in the Guard on duty 24/7, protecting the entire country—300 of them protecting the entire United States. That is a worthy mission that we are glad is done so well by the members of the Alaska National Guard.

So this bill does a lot. The NDAA this year, which we are debating on the floor now, finally takes seriously this important mission of missile defense. As I have noted, it does a lot to advance it.

We have a couple of additional amendments that we are working on and hopefully are going to get passed out of the managers' package that would make even more advances to missile defense. We are going to continue to work those, and, hopefully, we will continue to have the bipartisan support that we did when this bill was marked up.

I remain hopeful that we are finally starting to reverse the trend in missile defense that, as I noted earlier, was one of high ambition followed by increasing modesty.

Today we need ambition, and we need action. The threat warrants it. The American people demand it. The Congress must step up and deliver it. That is what is happening in this NDAA, along with many other important and critical provisions for our Nation's military. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of passage of this important bill.

TRIBUTE TO MICAH MCKINNIS

Madam President, Micah McKinnis began working for me 2 years ago as my military legislative correspondent. He is actually sitting with me right now, and today is his last day in my office. It is a sad day for everyone in my office, but Micah is going on to do bigger and better things with that unit I just talked about, the Alaska National Guard.

While in my office he has done amazing work, including championing my India policy and fighting for more resources for our combat rescue squadrons and playing an important role in helping us develop this missile defense bill. I am genuinely happy for him and his wife, and I look forward to seeing them up in Alaska, as he is getting ready to go join the military himself. He is going to head out for training. He is looking to be a pararescue member of the military. It is some of the toughest training we have in the U.S. military, but I know he is going to do very well.

So Micah, thanks for all you have done, all the things you have done for Alaska. You will always be part of our family. Good luck to you and your family.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote for a bipartisan amendment, No. 1051, to protect transgender servicemembers in our military.

I want to thank my dear friend and colleague, Senator MCCAIN, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and his staff, for working with us on this bipartisan amendment to protect transgender servicemembers and for agreeing to support it here on the floor today.

The amendment, which I was so proud to write with my Republican colleague from Maine, Senator SUSAN COLLINS, would prohibit the Department of Defense from discharging members of the military or denying them reenlistment opportunities because of their gender identity. It is essential that this Congress does not break faith with these brave servicemembers who have served their country honorably and with great sacrifice.

As Members of the Senate, one of our most serious responsibilities is to stand up for the men and women who serve in our armed services. We have an obligation to represent their interests, to value and respect their service, and to give them the tools and resources they need to defend our country. Kicking out thousands of servicemembers simply because of their gender identity doesn't make our military stronger, it makes our military weaker. It doesn't save taxpayer money, it wastes taxpayer money. We have spent millions recruiting and training these highly skilled servicemembers.

I want to be clear to those who misunderstand our U.S. military members, to those who somehow think our military cannot handle diversity among its servicemembers: Do not underestimate the men and women who serve in uniform. They represent the best and strongest among us.

An argument against diversity in the military is wrong. We heard this argument during the fight to end racial segregation. We heard it during the fight to allow women to serve. We heard it during the fight to end don't ask, don't tell, which I was proud to work on with the Republican Senator from Maine once again. And here, once again, this argument is wrong. Our military is strongest when it represents the Nation it serves.

Rather than shrinking the talent pool and telling patriotic Americans that they cannot serve, we should be doing everything we can to encourage and support them. We should thank them for their devotion to service, for their willingness to leave their families for months at a time and risk their own lives and safety to protect us.

This transgender ban affects individuals who were brave enough to join the military, men and women who were tough enough to make it through rigorous military training, men and women who love our country enough to risk their lives for it, to fight for it and even die for it. To suggest these brave, tough, and selfless transgender Americans somehow don't belong in our military is harmful to our military readiness, and it is deeply insulting to our troops.

Don't tell me that U.S. Air Force SSgt Logan Ireland, who deployed to Afghanistan and has earned numerous

commendations since the ban on transgender service was lifted, should be kicked out of our military. Don't tell me a young recruit like U.S. Marine Aaron Wixson, who left college to enlist in the field artillery and worked diligently with his chain of command during his gender transition to meet every requirement asked of him, should be kicked out of the military. Do not tell me that Navy LCDR Blake Dremann, who identified as transgender while serving in Afghanistan and has deployed 11 times and won the Navy's highest logistics award and now shapes our military policy at the Pentagon—don't tell me he should be kicked out of the military. Any individual serving in our military today who meets the standards should be allowed to serve, period.

I urge my colleagues to join me, the Republican Senator from Maine, and Senator JOHN MCCAIN, on our bipartisan amendment to allow transgender men and women to stay in the military and continue to serve our country and keep us safe.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my bipartisan amendment with Senator LEE calling for a ''think first'' assessment of recent Russian violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty and the response of the United States.

The INF Treaty has been the bedrock of European security for nearly three decades, and Congress must ask a few reasonable questions before we fund a missile research and development program that our military leaders have not asked for, that our allies do not want, that would undermine the spirit and intent of our longstanding treaty commitment, and that would make the world a more dangerous place.

No one is more concerned about Russia's recent aggression than I am. From their annexation of Crimea to their meddling in our election and the elections of our allies, Russia's behavior must be met with a firm and unequivocal response.

Last month, I traveled to the Baltics to see firsthand the threat Russia poses to NATO allies and to meet with senior U.S. Army officials and local political leaders. On that trip, one thing was abundantly clear: We need to be tough in the face of Russian provocation, but we also need to be smart. That is what our amendment is about today. It isn't about playing politics; it is about smart, strategic, informed toughness that advances the interests of the United States of America.

The INF treaty, negotiated and signed by President Reagan nearly 30 years ago, erased an entire class of nuclear weapons from the European continent. It eliminated ground-launched missiles with a range of 500 to 5,500 kilometers—roughly up to twice the distance between Moscow and Paris. This is also the same class of missile that Russia deployed earlier this year, in violation of the treaty.

Russia's treaty violations have been widely reported. There is no question that bringing Russia back into compliance with the treaty must be a top priority. Russian compliance is in the best interest of the United States, it is in the best interest of our European and Asia Pacific allies, and it is ultimately in the best interest of the Russian Federation. But this is a tough job. Our military leaders have told us they see no indication that Russia plans to resume honoring its treaty obligations anytime soon.

In the short term, we must ensure that Russia does not gain a military advantage from its violation and that Russia—Russia—takes the blame on the world stage for breaking this treaty. We cannot accomplish these goals by signaling to the world that we have lost faith in the very treaty we seek to preserve. But that is exactly what section 1635 of the NDAA would do. This section calls for the ''establishment of a research and development program for a dual-capable, road-mobile, ground-launched missile system with a maximum range of 5,500 kilometers''—or, in plain language, the development of a new nuclear missile that we have publicly sworn never to test or deploy.

The proposed R&D program is in itself not a violation of the INF treaty, which only bans testing and deployment, but there is no denying that such a missile program is a violation of the spirit and intent of our treaty commitment, and that is exactly how our allies and adversaries alike will see it.

The reality of this proposal is crystal clear: Either we are authorizing millions of taxpayer dollars to be wasted on research and development of a missile we never intend to build or test, or we are pushing the door wide open to an upcoming violation of the INF Treaty.

In opening that door, we would be signaling not only to the Russians but also to our treaty partners around the world that the United States is preparing to walk away from a nuclear treaty commitment. In sending that signal, we are basically giving Russia the excuse it is looking for to shed remaining international constraints, to justify an acceleration of its intermediate-range nuclear program, and to spark a new contest of nuclear escalation. Such a move can quickly increase the number of nuclear weapons deployed throughout the world and send the globe into a second cold war reality—a reality where we live with the constant threat that one preemptive move, one miscalculation could wipe away everything we hold dear.

Supporters claim that a new missile is needed not only to compete with Russia but also to counter a more assertive China, which is not bound by the agreement. But I have seen no evidence to support these arguments. If anything, a tit-for-tat response is more likely to embolden Putin to up the ante by deploying some more missiles and perhaps withdrawing from the INF Treaty altogether.

The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Paul Selva, has already told us that a new intermediate-range missile is not necessary to hold targets in China at risk.

To ensure that our response to Russian treaty violations is based in international strategy rather than just in knee-jerk responses, Senator LEE and I are offering a commonsense amendment requiring that before we spend a dime of taxpayer money on the proposed missile program, the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State should work together to address a few critical questions.

First, what is the status, capability, and threat posed to our allies by Russia's new ground-launched cruise missile?

Secretary Mattis has stated that Russia's treaty violation would not provide Russia with a ''significant military advantage.'' Is this still the Secretary's assessment? General Selva has said: ''Given the location of the specific missile and the deployment, [the Russians] don't gain any advantage in Europe.'' Is this still the general's assessment? We should not blindly commit taxpayer money and undermine our treaty commitment without understanding the threat.

Second, does our military believe that a new ground-launched, intermediate-range missile that is not compliant with our treaty obligations is our most effective response to Russia?

The Pentagon did not request funding for a new intermediate-range missile. According to a report by the Pentagon just last year, there are multiple options on the table to pressure Russia back into treaty compliance, including enhancements to the European Reassurance Initiative and additional active defenses. That is in addition to the other available tools of national power that could strengthen, rather than weaken, the INF Treaty.

The Pentagon advocated for just such a multipronged approach, writing that ''Russia's return to compliance with its obligations under the INF treaty remains the preferable outcome, which argues against unilateral U.S. withdrawal or abrogation of the INF treaty at this time.''

With the Pentagon reviewing options, Congress's proposed playground approach of ''if you build a ground-based missile, I will build one too'' is not the strategic response of generals and statesmen. In fact, the administration has said that this new program would ''unhelpfully'' tie them ''to a specific type of missile system . . . which would limit potential military response options'' at a time when DOD, State, and Treasury are ''developing an integrated diplomatic, military, and economic response strategy to maximize pressure on Russia.'' We must let our military leaders and our diplomats

do their jobs and inform Congress before we act.

Third question: Will our NATO allies stand with us in this response, and will any of our allies even be willing to host such a missile system if we decide to deploy it?

Given our geographic advantages, a missile of this range does no good on U.S. soil; it only works if it is installed on the ground of our NATO allies.

The last time the United States weighed a land-based escalation in Europe, millions of citizens took to the streets in protest, and in the 21st century, that call for nuclear disarmament of the European continent has only grown. As General Selva recently acknowledged, we don't even know whether any of our European allies would permit the deployment of a nuclear-capable ground-launched missile on their territory.

During the Cold War, Russian deployments of land-based cruise missiles targeting Europe were, in part, a ploy to cause division among the NATO countries, and the same could be said today. It is critical that we respond as one indivisible NATO coalition, unshaken by Russia's provocations.

So that is it—three must-ask questions deserving of must-have answers: What is the nature of the threat? What is the Pentagon's recommended military response? What action unites us with our NATO allies? Until we have those answers, heading down the path of destroying the INF Treaty is grossly irresponsible.

Support to reduce the number of nuclear weapons and prevent their spread to more nations has always been a nonpartisan issue.

When President Reagan signed this treaty into law, he said that ''patience, determination, and commitment made this impossible vision [of the INF Treaty] a reality.'' Ever since then, the treaty has served as the bedrock of our efforts to build a safe and peaceful world in a nuclear age; to build a world where schoolchildren spend their days learning to read and write, not practicing duck-and-cover drills; to build a world where families live in hope for what tomorrow may bring, not in fear that a flash of light may sweep away everything they love; to build a world that looks to the United States to steadily lead toward sustained peace and security. This amendment continues in that spirit.

I thank Senator LEE for his leadership on this bipartisan effort. When we announced this amendment, he said that the amendment ''would set the precedent that the [United States] should not immediately react to an adversary's treaty violation by violating the same treaty ourselves. That's not how working in good faith in the international community is done.'' He is right.

I want to acknowledge Senator CARDIN, the ranking member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator FEINSTEIN, a longtime arms control champion, and thank them for their leadership to prevent nuclear proliferation and ensure that America upholds its international obligations. I thank Senator REED, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, for his strong support on this issue. We are all grateful for his efforts.

On the 30th anniversary of the treaty, we must give no cause to doubt that the United States stands by its word, that it is committed to this treaty, and that it is committed to working with allies to bring Russia back into compliance.

The INF Treaty removed thousands of nuclear weapons from the face of the globe, and we must be certain that we have exhausted all options before we walk away from it.

Rather than simply dusting off a nuclear escalation play from the early 1980s, I ask my colleagues to join us in allowing the Secretaries of Defense and State to do their jobs, to weigh the options, and to recommend a course of action. I ask them to join us in allowing information and strategy to guide our policy. I ask them to join us in supporting this amendment to the NDAA.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I would like to express my support for the ongoing deliberative process to address the very valid concerns raised with sections 881 and 886 of the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act. Earlier today, I filed an amendment that seeks to clarify the committee's intent with respect to open source requirements and intellectual property rights and protections for U.S. technology vendors who collaborate with the Department of Defense. I want to be clear that this language does not represent the ultimate fix, but rather a step in the right direction as we embark on a longer policy discussion in conference.

I want to thank the chairman, my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee, and my counterparts on the House Armed Services Committee for their commitment to continue this conversation in conference. It is essential that we provide both the Department and industry the proper tools, protections, and incentives necessary to continue these mutually beneficial partnerships on the commercial off-the-shelf and the custom-developed software side. I am confident we can reach consensus and send the President language that clearly articulates a fair and sustainable model for existing and future contracts.

Madam President, as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Personnel, I would like to make a statement for the record about an item of special interest related to the Department of Defense's use of its intellectual property rights in certain drug products within the committee report on the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

The committee report contains language that directs the Defense Department to exercise its rights under the Bayh-Dole Act ''to authorize third parties to use inventions that benefited from DOD funding whenever the price of a drug, vaccine, or other medical technology is higher in the United States'' as compared to prices in foreign countries.

This language is of concern to me for several reasons. The DOD and other Federal agencies face significant obstacles such as low procurement quantities, high regulatory risk, and complex Federal contracting regulations when working to attract the top vaccine and drug developers as partners in medical countermeasure development to protect the warfighter and America's citizens. Diluting intellectual property protections as a means of price control will not only fail to meet its objective, but it could significantly hamper the government's efforts to develop these critical medical capabilities. The report language could lead to decreased investments in medical countermeasures development and a drop-off in industry partnerships with DOD that can ultimately result in few new drugs, vaccines, and diagnostics.

Bayh-Dole has created a fragile ecosystem of collaboration among Federal agencies, public research institutions, and private industry, resulting in the commercialization of inventions for use by the American people, especially in the area of medical countermeasures often developed specifically for our servicemembers and veterans. The idea of regulating the price of a commercialized invention was never contemplated by Congress when passing the Bayh-Dole Act.

I have concerns that the committee report language could chill medical innovation by raising the risk of a Federal partnership to a level that is unacceptable for many private entities. This is problematic for small businesses that have less capital to risk on products subject to unpredictable price controls. While the availability of medical innovations to the American public remains an area of great interest to me, I strongly believe that we should pursue more appropriate and effective ways to achieve this goal without stifling innovation or discouraging public private partnerships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have just spoken with Chairman MCCAIN about the status of the Defense bill. He and Senator REED have already processed more than 100 amendments to the bill with broad bipartisan input. Unfortunately, the two sides have now reached an impasse on further amendments. Senator MCCAIN has offered a reasonable list that could have been voted on this afternoon, but it appears we are not able to enter that agreement because of issues unrelated to NDAA. Therefore, it is my hope that we can move to finish the bill sooner rather than later and vote to invoke cloture this afternoon.

The Senate will vote on a critical HUD nomination after lunch, and it is my hope that we can move the cloture vote on NDAA to occur in that stack after lunch.

Our next order of business will be, following the Defense authorization bill, the nomination of the Solicitor General. This is the person in the Justice Department who argues before the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court October term begins shortly.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 109, as under the previous order, and that following disposition of the nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and consideration of H.R. 2810.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 105, Noel Francisco.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Noel J. Francisco, of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Noel J. Francisco, of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

Mitch McConnell, John Kennedy, Lamar Alexander, Johnny Isakson, Mike Rounds, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Patrick J. Toomey, Cory Gardner, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Lisa Murkowski, Thom Tillis.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I thank the majority leader for all the support and assistance we have been given on this issue. Of course, I regret that we finally had to turn to cloture. The fact is that we have incorporated over 100 amendments offered by Senators of both parties, and it means the NDAA becomes stronger as a result of including these amendments. Second, the process took a step in the right direction, as Senators were able to have their voices and opinions heard and reflected in this legislation.

I wish we had never had to come to voting for cloture, but I wish to say that we have made enormous progress. We have had debate. We have had amendments. We have had votes. All of these are the ''regular order'' that some of us have been arguing for that the U.S. Senate—in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

I am very appreciative of the cooperation of Members on both sides, including Senator REED. I believe we can be proud of our product. It came down to about four amendments on which we could never get agreement to move forward—that compared to the over 100 amendments we were able to adopt.

I still wish we had been able to go completely through this process without having to resort to cloture, but I do want to thank Members on both sides—as we approach cloture—for their cooperation, for their involvement, for their engagement, and for their dedication to the men and women who are serving us in the military.

We look forward to the next hours. We will have debate and hopefully some amendments proposed, vote cloture, and have it completed sometime early next week. The work that needs to be done will be done, accomplished before then.

I thank all my colleagues for their participation. I thank them for their engagement and involvement. I am proud of this product, which comes after hundreds of hours of hearings, of negotiation, of discussion, and of debate, because it proves that the first priority of Members on both sides of the aisle is the men and women in the military and their ability to defend the Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I want to join the chairman with respect to noting the progress we have made with respect to 100 amendments. They have been bipartisan. They have been carefully weighed by the staff.

We are still continuing to work together to see if there are additional amendments we can incorporate before we conclude this bill. I think the amendments have strengthened the bill. I think it does reflect the bipartisan effort.

Also, along with the chairman, we would have liked to have been able to do more and have more debate, more votes, but at the end of the day, we are going to have a national defense authorization bill that responds to current threats, that responds to the stresses and demands on our personnel across the globe, and also be well positioned to go into conference and hopefully further improve this legislation in the conference process.

Once again, I will say this is in large part the result of Chairman MCCAIN's leadership—creating an atmosphere of bipartisan cooperation, of thoughtful debate, and doing it in a way that brings out the best in all of us. I thank him for that.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Pamela Hughes Patenaude, of New Hampshire, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 40 minutes of debate, equally divided between the two sides in the usual form.

The Senator from Oregon.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the most important words in our Constitution are the first three words: ''We the People.'' That is the mission statement for the United States of America. It is written in big, bold, beautiful letters so that even from across the room, if you can't read the details, you know what our Nation is all about. As President Lincoln summarized, a Nation ''of the people, by the people, for the people.''

What we have seen this year is quite an assault on this vision of government of, by, and for the people. It came in the form of President Trump's plan to rip healthcare from millions of Americans in order to deliver billions of dollars to the very richest among us—plan after plan, version after version, wiping out healthcare for 24 million, wiping out healthcare for 23 million, wiping out healthcare for 32 million, and so on and so forth, always over 20 million, and always delivering this enormous gift of hundreds of billions of dollars to the richest Americans.

You look at this from a little bit of distance, and it is just incredible to imagine that this could have occurred—that any member, a single member of our Nation would possibly

have supported such an outrageous, diabolical, dangerous, damaging plan to the quality of life for so many people across our Nation.

It wasn't just that it ripped healthcare from more than 20 million people. It wasn't just that it delivered billions of dollars to the wealthiest among us. It also ensured that those with preexisting conditions wouldn't be able to get care. It was also that it would have raised our premiums an estimated 20 percent for those who were able to secure insurance.

If one set out to design the worst possible healthcare plan you could ever imagine, you probably couldn't come up with one as bad as President Trump and the Republican team came up with. It seems incredible that we are still debating the basic premise of whether healthcare should be part of a standard foundation for families to thrive here in this century. Every other developed nation understands that healthcare is so essential to quality of life, so essential for our children to thrive, so essential for our families to succeed that they make sure that, just by virtue of living in a country, you have that healthcare.

Well, I have to salute the millions of Americans who weighed in to say that this diabolical plan needed to be dumped. They filled our streets and overflowed our inboxes and flooded our phones. They made it perfectly clear that healthcare is a basic human right, not a privilege reserved for the healthy and the wealthy. I certainly agree with them. We decided collectively that we were not going to allow this diabolical plan to undo the progress we made. We made significant progress with ObamaCare. After decades of being essentially unable to change the uninsured rate, we made significant progress. There we are with a big drop in the uninsured rate—a big increase in the number of people who have access to healthcare. But we are not in that place yet where this number drops to zero. We still have 10 percent of our country that doesn't have insurance. The costs are still too high, and the deductibles and copays are too high. One out of five Americans can still not afford their prescriptions.

In addition, we have this incredibly complicated set of healthcare systems. We have Medicare and Medicaid. We have on-exchange, and we have off-exchange. We have the Children's Health Insurance Program. We have workers' compensation. We have self-insurance. We have a multitude of varieties of healthcare through the workplace—some covering just the individual, others covering the entire family, some covering just a small percent of the healthcare costs and some more. Some are certainly so complicated that even the folks who have them aren't sure what the insurance company should pay.

So we found in this conversation with Americans about healthcare that Americans weighed in very strongly about the stresses and the challenges of ordinary Americans to secure healthcare. It is an ongoing lifelong effort. Do you have an employer who covers you but not your children? Can you get them on the Children's Health Insurance Program? Do you have an insurance plan at work that you have to contribute to, but the costs of contributing are so high that you really can't afford it? Do you opt out of that? Then, what happens? Or perhaps you are under Medicaid—up to 138 percent of the poverty level for those States that have expanded Medicaid—and you gain a small increase in your pay and maybe now you don't qualify. In the middle of the year, can you apply to the healthcare exchange? Will you get tax credits credited to you or will you have to pay a big sum at the end of the year when your taxes are reconciled? It is continuous applications, continuous change, and continuous stress. Why do we make it that hard?

In my 36 town halls a year—one in every county in Oregon, mostly in red counties because most of the counties in Oregon are red counties—I have had people coming out yearning for a simple, seamless system that says: Just by virtue of being an American, you have healthcare when you need it and you will not end up bankrupt. What is that vision all about? It is about taking an existing model, one that has worked so well for our seniors—the model of Medicare.

Folks used to come to my town halls and they would say: I am just trying to stay alive until I reach age 65 so that I can be part of that wonderful healthcare plan—that Medicare plan. So this is a well-known commodity. I have heard some of my colleagues mocking it in the last few days. Well, certainly, maybe they should get out and have town halls. Maybe they should talk to our seniors about how well this system works. Maybe they should recognize that the overhead costs are much lower—2 percent versus 20 percent, and sometimes much more in private insurance healthcare. That is more than a fifth of our healthcare dollars simply wasted—a waste that disappears with Medicare for All.

This is the type of healthcare system that addresses and changes this enormous, fractured, and stressful system. We currently spend twice as much as other developed nations per person on healthcare—twice as much as France, twice as much as Canada, twice as much as Germany, and the list goes on. Yet the healthcare we receive provides less health in America than in those countries.

We should be ashamed that our infant mortality rates are higher, even though we spend twice as many dollars per capita as those other countries. So it is clear that there is significant room for improvement. By the way, there are so many opportunities to move in this direction.

We laid out this Medicare for All plan, and I salute my colleague BERNIE SANDERS and my additional cosponsors. There are now 17 Senators who have said: We are cosponsors to this because we know that it addresses the fractured, stressful nature of our system. We know it is more cost-effective than our current system. We know that it will lead to greater peace of mind than our current system.

Shouldn't peace of mind be what we are all about? That is the peace of mind that if your loved one gets ill or injured, they will get the care they need. The peace of mind that if your loved one is in an accident, they will get the care they need and you will not end up bankrupt.

It is time for America to have this conversation, and it is my intention, certainly, to have this conversation with the citizens of Oregon and to encourage my colleagues to have this conversation with their citizens. How can we move to a system where you can stop worrying about whether you will get the care you need, whether your loved ones will get the care they need, and that you will not end up bankrupt when you are sick or injured? That is the goal.

Let's have that conversation, America, and keep pushing toward making it a reality. I am proud to sponsor this bill. I certainly am proud to fight for quality affordable healthcare for every single American because it is a basic human right.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

CONGRATULATING THE WATERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL FIELD HOCKEY PROGRAM

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, before I start my remarks on the dangers of nuclear war, I want to take a moment to congratulate the Watertown High School field hockey program in Massachusetts.

Up until this past week, the Watertown Raiders had not lost a single field hockey game since November 12, 2008. For nearly 9 years, the Raiders have been truly perfect. Their 184-game winning streak was our Nation's longest in high school field hockey history. Their leader, Head Coach Eileen Donahue, is one of the most historic figures in Massachusetts high school athletics.

To all the former and current players, coaches, parents and supporters, I offer my congratulations on this incredible accomplishment.

Go, Watertown Raiders. Congratulations on a historic streak of victories.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. President, now on the issue of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons give the President of the United States an unprecedented and awesome power. Nuclear weapons are the most destructive force in human history. Yet, under existing laws, the President of the United States possesses unilateral authority to launch them. If the President wants to, he has the power to initiate an offensive nuclear war, even if there is no attack on the United States or its allies. This is simply unconstitutional,

undemocratic, and simply unbelievable.

Such unconstrained power flies in the face of our Constitution, which gives Congress the sole and exclusive power to declare war. While it is vital for the President to have clear authority to respond to nuclear attacks on the United States, our forces, or our allies, no U.S. President should have the power to launch a nuclear first strike without congressional approval.

Such a strike would be immoral. It would be disproportionate, and it would expose the United States to the threat of devastating nuclear retaliation, which could endanger the survival of the American people and human civilization. If we lead potential enemies to believe that we may go nuclear in response to a conventional attack, then we create the very pressure that encourages them to build nuclear arsenals and keep them on high alert. This increases the risk of inadvertent nuclear war, a prospect that is just plain unacceptable.

We have the world's most powerful conventional arsenal—the strongest Air Force, the largest Navy, and the most capable Army and Marine Corps. And we have the most powerful nuclear arsenal to deter nuclear attacks. We don't need to threaten to be the first to attack with nuclear weapons to deter others from launching attacks on us or our allies.

Nuclear weapons are meant for deterrence and not for warfighting. As President Reagan said: ''A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.''

That is why I introduced legislation earlier this year and submitted an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, which we are now considering, to put an appropriate check on the American President's unilateral authority to launch a nuclear first strike.

Let me be clear. I am not proposing we restrict the President's authority under the Constitution to launch a nuclear attack against anyone who is carrying out a nuclear attack on the United States, our territories, or our allies. Under article II of the Constitution, the United States President has authority to repel sudden attacks as soon as our military and intelligence agencies inform him that such an enemy strike is imminent. What I have proposed does not change that.

But what I am proposing is that we take a commonsense step to check nuclear first use by prohibiting any American President from launching a nuclear first strike, except when explicitly authorized to do so by a congressional declaration of war.

Unfortunately, the need to submit this into law is more important now than it has ever been, and that is because today we have a President who is engaged in escalatory, reckless, and downright scary rhetoric with North Korea, a nation with nuclear weapons. President Trump has threatened ''fire and fury'' and has declared our military ''locked and loaded'' and ready to attack North Korea. On what seems like a daily basis, President Trump uses the kind of inflammatory rhetoric backed by his unchecked authority to launch nuclear weapons, which highlights the very situation I described earlier.

The United States threatens military action that could include nuclear weapons, North Korea responds with increasingly provocative behavior, and the world faces an ever-increasing risk of miscalculation that can lead to nuclear war.

I have been talking about no first use and the need to provide an appropriate check on any American President for a long time, but President Trump and his Twitter account have made it painfully clear why the need for a no-first-use policy exists.

No human being should have the sole authority to initiate an unprovoked nuclear war, not any American President, including Donald Trump. As long as that power exists, it must be put in check.

We need to have this debate in the United States of America. We don't need an accidental nuclear war. We don't need nuclear weapons to be used by the United States when we have not been attacked by nuclear weapons. And if any President would want to use that power, then he should come to Congress and ask us to vote on the use of nuclear weapons in the event we have never been attacked by them. That is the least I think the Congress should do.

We have abdicated our responsibility to declare war under the Constitution for far too long. It actually began with the Korean war. Now we face the prospect of a second Korean war. If nuclear weapons are going to be used and we have not been attacked, it should be this body that votes to give the President the ability to use those weapons.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to confirm Pamela Patenaude as Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Ms. Patenaude was advanced by voice vote out of the Senate Banking Committee on June 14, and continues to receive nearly unanimous bipartisan support from affordable housing advocates, public housing agencies, and industry leaders.

This month, Senate leadership received a joint letter signed by over 60 independent housing trade groups, urging that this nomination finally be brought to the floor for a vote.

Over her distinguished career, Ms. Patenaude has touched nearly every corner of housing policy and has held leadership roles at both the local and Federal level.

This is not the first time Ms. Patenaude has been considered for confirmation by this body. Twelve years ago, the Senate confirmed her by voice vote to become Assistant Secretary of Community Planning and Development at HUD.

The Senate recognized her back then for what she remains today: an experienced industry veteran who will provide steadfast leadership to HUD.

This vote is particularly important given the recent hurricanes in Texas and in Florida. HUD's Deputy Secretary chairs the Department's Disaster Management Group and coordinates the long-term recovery efforts of various program offices within HUD.

Ms. Patenaude would make an immediate contribution in this critical leadership role, drawing from her experience responding to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita during her time as Assistant Secretary in the Bush administration.

I am eager to work with Ms. Patenaude on that response, as well as other key issues within HUD's jurisdiction.

I urge my colleagues to vote to confirm Ms. Patenaude today, and I also urge the Senate to take up votes on other HUD nominees, so that HUD can have the key leadership in place that it needs to best serve its important mission.

Thank you.

Mr. MARKEY. 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. 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.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the nomination of Pam Patenaude to be Deputy Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Ms. Patenaude comes to this nomination with valuable experience in the field of housing and community development and a history of affordable housing advocacy. In her previous work at HUD, she helped administer the Department's disaster relief efforts following Hurricane Katrina.

While I don't agree with Ms. Patenaude on every element of housing policy, I respect her experience, and I respect her government service in her recent work to raise awareness about the affordable housing shortage facing so many families.

I agreed with her in her testimony in front of the Banking Committee that ''as a nation we must recognize that housing is not just a commodity but a foundation for economic mobility and personal growth.'' That is why I was so troubled that during her nomination hearing, Ms. Patenaude defended the administration's terrible budget for the agency she has been nominated to help lead. The President would cut more than $7 billion, 15 percent, from HUD's budget, right in the midst of a shortage of affordable housing, about which she so articulately spoke. This budget cut

would eliminate programs like community development block grants and the HOME Program. These grants help our cities and small towns repair their infrastructure, retrofit homes for seniors and people with disabilities, combat homelessness among families, veterans, and people struggling with mental illness and substance abuse.

Just last week, Congress approved new CDBG funds to speed up disaster recovery assistance to communities upended by Hurricanes Harvey and Irma. Ms. Patenaude came in front of this committee and defended those budget cuts—programs for which she has advocated but doing, apparently, the dirty work for the administration and for the HUD Secretary, she agreed with this budget.

This budget would devastate public housing. It would cut funding for major repairs by some 70 percent. Again, in the face of substandard housing, unavailable shortages of affordable housing, it would cut funding for repairs by 70 percent, and it would expose more families to poor building conditions and health hazards.

I have told this story before on the floor. My wife and I live in Cleveland, OH, in ZIP Code 44105. Ten years ago, in 2007, that ZIP Code had more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States of America. Within a not very great distance from my home, there is block after block of homes that are in need of repair—rentals and people living in homes they own—far too much devastation, crying out for some help from this HUD budget. Yet this administration turns their back on them.

It reduces funding for lead hazard control and healthy housing grants. Secretary Carson, whom I voted for—and not many Democrats did—I voted for him because he is a neurosurgeon. He didn't know much about housing when he took this job, but he knew about lead paint and what the exposure to lead meant to babies and infants. Yet this budget cuts lead hazard control.

I know, in my city, the public health department has said that in the old sections in my city of Cleveland, where homes are generally 60, 70, 80 years old, virtually almost every single home has high toxic levels of lead. Do we not care about what we sentence the next generation of children to by doing nothing about the lead-based paint around the windows, the lead around the pipes? All of that we have a moral responsibility to do something about.

These cuts to HUD programs have generated bipartisan concern about their effects on our communities, including concerns raised, in fact, by Republican members of the Banking Committee.

I am voting against Ms. Patenaude's nomination because I can't support the direction the President's budget proposes for HUD, proposes for housing, proposes for our communities, and proposes for our country. She has pledged allegiance—in spite of her background, her skills, and her advocacy inside and outside the Department since, she has pledged allegiance to that disastrous vision and those horrible budget cuts to HUD.

I hope she uses her experience and knowledge to convince others in the administration of the importance of the Federal Government's role in housing and community development.

Too often, in this administration, we see officials who come to their agencies with valuable experience and they quickly set it aside to push an agenda that does not serve working families in Appalachia, OH, and inner-city Ohio, in inner-ring suburbs, and affluent suburbs.

We have two very visible crises; one on the gulf coast and one stretching from Florida to the Virgin Islands, which we absolutely must tackle. We have a less visible crisis as well—not because of flooding or hurricanes but because decent affordable housing is beyond the reach of more and more Americans.

Ms. Patenaude is intelligent. She has good insight. She knows this. She knows in her heart what this budget would mean to a whole lot of Americans who work full time, who have generally low incomes—$8, $10, $12 an hour—who simply can't find affordable, clean decent housing. Her support for that budget will make the problem worse, and it is very troubling. I ask my colleagues to vote no on her nomination.

DATA BREACHES IN CREDIT REPORTING AGENCIES

Mr. President, last week, 143 million Americans—in essence, half of our country—had their personal information exposed through no fault of their own. We are talking about names, dates of birth, Social Security numbers, addresses, and probably much more.

Equifax, one of three huge data collection companies in our country, makes their money off of this information, and they failed to protect it.

If a student at Bowling Green, in Northwest Ohio, or a homeowner in Springfield, OH, fails to make that monthly payment for her student loan debt or for their home mortgage, Equifax dings them on their credit report. Yet Equifax, even after last year when they allowed the breach of 400,000 employees of an Ohio company, Kroger—one of our best companies domiciled in Ohio—they just don't seem accountable when that happens. This is the worst example, so far, that we have seen.

I spoke yesterday on the phone with Bill of Hamilton, OH, who is one of those 143 million Americans whose personal data was exposed to criminals, to somebody who can use this information, use this data, on literally up to 143 million Americans. Bill and his wife are retired. They have worked hard to pay their bills. They have excellent credit. He went to the Equifax website after this happened and discovered his information may have been breached.

He talked about how worried he was. He talked about, after all his family's hard work, after years of following the rules, that someone could get access to his personal information and shred his credit history.

This is a company whose job it is to gather this data and to protect this data, and they failed, without being held accountable.

I am worried for folks in Ohio like Bill.

I am really worried for servicemembers around this country whose private information might be compromised. The servicemember's credit history isn't just important when they want to buy a home or open up a new credit card. For a servicemember, a credit history damaged by hackers could mean losing their security clearance and maybe their job along with it. These patriotic men and women move around the country, around the world. They are not especially well paid. Their families rely on good credit to get housing and jobs wherever our military chooses to send them.

Life for military families is stressful enough. I know that from Ray Patterson Air Force Base, one of the most important Air Force Bases in this country, near Dayton. I know that from meeting with these families. I know that when I see the kinds of consumer protections the Federal consumer bureau has provided to these servicemembers. So often financial companies try to prey on these servicemembers who, as I said, are not paid well. Maybe a servicemember is deployed overseas and the family struggles at home without one of their parents being present and with the generally low income they make. They sacrifice enough without them also having to worry about credit corporations and this company's breach putting them at risk.

That is why I filed an amendment to the NDAA that would provide servicemembers with crucial consumer protections. First, the bill requires credit reporting agencies such as Equifax, TransUnion and Experian, the three big companies, to implement a cost-free and convenient way for all servicemembers to be able to lock down their credit reports if they think they are at risk.

While credit freezes are currently available in some States, there is no national standard. There are often charges for starting and stopping a freeze, and it can be hard to figure out whom they should even contact. This amendment would create a standard simple and free process for servicemembers to protect their credit histories.

There is so much more in this bill that will matter to servicemembers. We have an opportunity right now to move quickly to make sure this breach does not put our military men and women at risk.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Patenaude nomination?

Mr. BROWN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted ''yea''.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CASSIDY). Are there any other Senators in the chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 196 Ex.]

YEAS—80

Alexander	Feinstein	Murkowski
Baldwin	Fischer	Murphy
Barrasso	Flake	Murray
Bennet	Franken	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Peters
Burr	Grassley	Portman
Cantwell	Hassan	Reed
Capito	Hatch	Risch
Cardin	Heitkamp	Roberts
Carper	Heller	Rounds
Casey	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Shaheen
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Coons	Kaine	Stabenow
Corker	Kennedy	Strange
Cornyn	King	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Tester
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Leahy	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young
Ernst	Moran	

NAYS—17

Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Booker	Hirono	Udall
Brown	Markey	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Sanders	Wyden
Harris	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—3

Menendez	Nelson	Rubio

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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—Continued

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, there be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the substitute amendment No. 1003, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to make brief remarks and engage in a colloquy with the chairman and ranking member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I have filed Baldwin amendment No. 329. This deals with the subject matter of ''Buy American'' in the National Defense Authorization Act.

I have long been a strong supporter of our manufacturing sector, of our national security, and I believe this amendment strongly supports both.

All week we have been going back and forth about whether we are going to vote on amendments to this measure. The Senate is supposed to be an institution where we can debate and bring our ideas forward, represent our States, represent the hard workers of this Nation, and I reserve the right to object to this unanimous consent request because I am frustrated, on behalf of those I represent, that we are not going to see a vote on this ''Buy American'' amendment.

I would additionally note the unique status we have—actually, in this case, a Statement of Administration Policy indicating strong support for the amendment that I have filed. To me, the ultimate test will be what is in the final bill that is signed into law. I am going to continue to push on, but I am, again, disappointed that this Senate is not operating in a fashion where we can offer amendments, debate those amendments, and have votes on those amendments.

I wish to yield to both the chairman and ranking member, as we have had discussions on this subject matter during these negotiations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I thank her for her agreement that we should move forward with this important legislation, and I am very proud of the way this legislation has proceeded before the Senate most of the way. But now I am not very proud because we are now not allowing Senators to have a vote.

I do not agree with the amendment from the Senator from Wisconsin, but I strongly believe she should have the right to have her amendment considered, debated, and voted on.

I am very proud of the fact that we have approved and agreed to 103 amendments. We still have three or four amendments that have caused us to be where we are today. It will be a conference item, the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, and although I do not agree with it, I will certainly make sure that it is part of the conference.

But I want to remind my colleagues again that one of the reasons we had 107 votes for and 0 against is that we went through a process of days, weeks, and months of hearings, study, debate, discussion, and bringing it to the floor. That is the way the Senate should work.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin, and I want to tell her and the Senator from New York, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, that I will continue to do everything I can to make sure they are given the rights that they earned by being elected in the States they represent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out one of the shortcomings in this process, which is that we have not had a series of amendments on the floor to vote on.

Through the chairman's leadership, we have, as he has indicated, cleared 103 amendments on a bipartisan basis. We think we have legislation that is important for the Nation, particularly for our men and women in uniform.

Senator BALDWIN raises an extremely important question. ''Buy American'' is not only for the people we represent all across the country but for the quality of goods and services that our men and women in uniform will receive. I thank her, and I join with her in the frustration of not having a vote, despite the progress we have made in so many other areas. This is something that both the chairman and I would like to see remedied in the next national defense debate on the floor.

As the chairman pointed out, this will be an issue at conference. I know Senator BALDWIN will not cease her efforts. She has been incredibly tenacious in pushing forward this ''Buy American'' provision on behalf of her constituents and all of our constituents. I do, in fact, support this provision, and I will work to my utmost to see that we can move this issue forward. I appreciate very much the fact that it will be considered in conference.

Again, I think we have done a lot over the last several days with the leadership of Chairman MCCAIN. I regret that we can't wrap up this legislation with several votes on issues, which each side would like to see, but I commit myself to work with the Senator from Wisconsin to see if we can move this ''Buy American'' provision forward.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I had reserved the right to object, but I will not object to proceeding to the vote to move the NDAA forward. I would note that this amendment is germane

postcloture, and I still would like to see the Senate operate in a manner where Senators can bring forth their amendments, can debate them, and can get votes.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

There are now 10 minutes of debate, equally divided.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have no further use of the time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1003, as modified, to Calendar No. 175, H.R. 2810, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

John McCain, Mitch McConnell, John Thune, Thom Tillis, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Richard Burr, Michael B. Enzi, Orrin G. Hatch, Ted Cruz, John Cornyn, Dan Sullivan, Roy Blunt, Cory Gardner, Tim Scott, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1003, as modified, offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, to H.R. 2810, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted ''yea'' and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted ''yea''.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). Are there any other Senators in the chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 197 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Baldwin	Fischer	Murray
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Bennet	Franken	Peters
Blumenthal	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Reed
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Brown	Harris	Roberts
Cantwell	Hassan	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Sasse
Cardin	Heinrich	Schatz
Carper	Heitkamp	Schumer
Casey	Heller	Scott
Cassidy	Hirono	Shaheen
Cochran	Hoeven	Shelby
Collins	Inhofe	Stabenow
Coons	Johnson	Strange
Corker	Kaine	Sullivan
Cornyn	Kennedy	Tester
Cortez Masto	King	Thune
Cotton	Klobuchar	Tillis
Crapo	Lankford	Udall
Cruz	Manchin	Van Hollen
Daines	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Duckworth	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—9

Booker	Lee	Paul
Durbin	Markey	Sanders
Gillibrand	Merkley	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Burr	Menendez	Toomey
Isakson	Nelson	
Leahy	Rubio	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). On this vote, the yeas are 84, the nays are 9.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the Defense authorization bill.

Congress has passed this bipartisan legislation every year for the past 55 years. Once again, this year, the Senate is debating this critical legislation to provide our men and women in uniform with the resources they need to keep America safe.

This is a bipartisan bill. It represents the combined efforts of Members from both sides of the aisle. It was approved unanimously by the Senate Armed Services Committee. All 27 of our members voted for it. That is more than a quarter of this body.

The distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Arizona, spoke on the Senate floor on Monday about the geopolitical challenges we are facing and the need for this legislation. He is absolutely right.

The number and the complexity of the threats we face today are unprecedented. North Korea is relentlessly pursuing long-range ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads to our shores. Americans are informed about the sobering threat from the Kim regime because it has dominated much of the recent news, but it is by no means the only significant challenge we face. We remain a nation at war, with thousands of men and women in uniform still deployed to the Middle East and Afghanistan. Russia and China continue to undermine rules-based international order by developing advanced military capabilities designed specifically to counter U.S. defense systems. Iran continues to pursue regional dominance and regularly harasses U.S. ships and planes operating in that region.

These are needlessly provocative acts that carry risks of an accident or a miscalculation that could spiral into serious confrontation. Additional low-intensity conflicts continue to smolder across the globe, particularly in Southeast Asia, Africa, and the Arabian Peninsula, and each one has the potential to impact U.S. national security.

The global turmoil of today highlights why the bill before us is so very important. It will provide the resources necessary to defend our Nation in the face of those challenges. But the NDAA is about more than just answering these threats; it is about helping us here at home as well.

Last Friday, I visited Naval Station Norfolk and had an opportunity to meet with some of our Nation's best—the sailors and officers of the U.S. Navy. As we stood on the pier, we watched the USS *Abraham Lincoln* aircraft carrier depart and head out into the Atlantic and join other U.S. Navy ships responding to the damage caused by Hurricane Irma.

Fighting and winning wars is the primary mission of our military, but the American people depend on it for so much more. The destruction and the devastation caused by Hurricane Harvey and Hurricane Irma have brought this point home.

This bill authorizes the resources our men and women in uniform need to respond to these crises and to do the job the Nation asks of them. It also begins to address the readiness gaps that have emerged in recent years as the Department has been asked to do more with less.

Upon returning to the Department of Defense 4 years after retiring from military service, Secretary Mattis testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee about this very issue. He said: ''I have been shocked by what I have seen about our readiness to fight.'' Additional testimony from other military leaders has borne this assessment out as well.

Only 3 of the Army's 58 brigade combat teams are ready to ''fight tonight.'' Sixty-two percent of the Navy's F–18 fighters cannot fly. Approximately 80 percent of our Marine aviation units lack the minimum number of ready basic aircraft for training, and flight-hour averages are below the minimum standards required to achieve and to maintain adequate levels of readiness.

Following the direction by President Trump to rebuild the military and prioritization by Secretary Mattis to improve readiness, this bill authorizes $30 billion to address unmet requirements identified by the military services and our combatant commanders, and it provides additional resources to address emerging threats.

In the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, which I chair, we provided

over $500 million in additional funding for cooperative missile defense programs with Israel to fully meet the needs of our ally.

We also authorized an additional $200 million to approve the Ground-based Midcourse Defense, or the GMD, system. These increases include funds for the development of more capable boosters and funds to improve what our military calls ''discrimination,'' or the ability of the system to distinguish between hostile warheads and decoys and other debris in space. The GMD is our only missile defense system capable of defending the homeland from intercontinental ballistic missiles, and the smart, targeted increases made by the subcommittee have only become more necessary as North Korea continues to demonstrate increased capabilities.

The subcommittee's mark also fully supports the modernization of our nuclear forces and the Department of Energy's nuclear enterprise and the sustainment activities. As part of this effort, the subcommittee added almost $200 million to help address the backlog of deferred maintenance activities at our nuclear facilities. More than half of these facilities are over 40 years old, and roughly 30 percent date back to the era of the Manhattan Project. Dilapidated structures at these facilities pose safety risks to our workers and jeopardize essential operations.

This additional funding will enhance the administration's efforts to address the highest priority requirements and begin reducing the immense maintenance backlog, but more work will be required in future years to resolve this very longstanding issue.

The jurisdiction of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee also includes outer space. In the subcommittee's mark, we added over $700 million to address unfunded needs for space operations. This includes over $100 million to expand the development and testing of advanced prototypes in response to the urgent operational needs of our warfighters and an additional $35 million to expedite the development of advanced jam-resistant GPS receivers.

Our forces rely heavily on the capabilities provided by our satellites, and our adversaries know it. They are developing capabilities to target our space assets, and these investments are critical if we want to ensure our forces never have to face a day without space.

I am proud of the strong provisions the Strategic Forces Subcommittee contributed to the bill before us today. In addition to the steps taken in this bill to address current threats, it makes important investments in advanced technologies to stay ahead of the challenges we might face tomorrow. For example, the bill authorizes over $500 million in additional funding to support the Department's Third Offset Strategy and improve the U.S. military's technological superiority. It also prioritizes cyber security—an area of growing risk and opportunity as technology becomes more and more sophisticated.

I serve on the Cybersecurity Subcommittee, and last Congress I served as chairman of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, which then had jurisdiction over our cyber capabilities. In this year's bill, we are adding to those efforts that I worked on in past years to improve how we man, train, and equip our military's cyber forces. The committee added over $700 million for cyber-related requirements and included a number of policy provisions in this area, such as a requirement for the Department of Defense to undertake the first-ever cyber posture review, which will evaluate the military's policy and capabilities in the cyber domain.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to reply to an argument that was made earlier today by the Senator from Massachusetts against a provision in this bill responding to Russia's violation of the INF Treaty.

The bill before us today authorizes $65 million for researching a ground-launched cruise missile system. The committee's report on the bill explains this in greater detail, but I would like to make a few quick points, if I may.

First, the senior Senator from Massachusetts described this provision as a ''knee-jerk reaction.'' I would like to remind my colleagues that Russia's violation of the INF Treaty reportedly began in 2008. That was almost a decade ago. The United States formally raised it with Russian officials in May of 2013—4½ years ago.

This issue has been with us for some time and the provisions of this bill are anything but a knee-jerk reaction, which leads to my second point. The Senator argues that further study is needed and has proposed an amendment preventing any action from being taken before a report is complete.

In the last three Defense authorization bills, Congress has required some sort of study on this issue. The solution to this problem is not to require further studies. Costs must be imposed on Russia for violation, and that is what this provision does.

Finally, there was some discussion of the views of our military leaders, and the Senator quoted heavily from Gen. Paul Selva, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The General and I have discussed this issue, and we have discussed it when he appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee in July. He specifically identified using research and development programs, within the limits of the treaty, to increase pressure on the Russians.

That is exactly what this provision does. It does not violate the INF Treaty. It takes the first step to impose costs on Russia for its violation of this agreement.

Years have gone by, no action has been taken, and Russia has only increased its violation of the treaty. Waiting for more studies to be complete only ensures that Russia's actions will continue to go unanswered. Failing to hold Russia accountable risks undermining this agreement and our broader nonproliferation agenda.

In the words of President Obama:

> Rules must be binding. Violations must be punished. Words must mean something.

In closing, I want to express my thanks to the bill's managers for their hard work. I have truly appreciated all they have done to bring this bill to the floor. This legislation upholds the bipartisan tradition that has characterized the National Defense Authorization Act, which has enabled it to pass for 55 years in a row. This is a strong bill that will strengthen our military. It will help ensure the military can protect our Nation in a world full of challenges. From North Korea's belligerence to severe storms damaging our coasts, our military has a tough job to do. They must be prepared to do it. I hope my colleagues will join me in swiftly passing this bill.

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. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, the Presiding Officer has been presiding on many occasions when I have risen to speak about the need to repeal and replace ObamaCare, and although we did not succeed in our last effort in the beginning of August, I, personally, along with Senators GRAHAM, JOHNSON and HELLER, am making one more try, and folks ask why.

The simple answer I can give is, there is a fellow back home by the name of Moon Griffon. He is a conservative talk show host who speaks with passion about the Affordable Care Act. Why does he speak with passion? Moon Griffon is very open. He has a special needs child, and he has to buy insurance. His premium per year is over $40,000—$40,000, with a $5,000 deductible and an additional deductible for his pharmaceutical costs. He has to pay $50,000 a year for insurance, deductible, and pharmaceutical deductible. The mortgage payment for a $500,000 home is what he puts up because he has to buy insurance. He has a child with special needs.

Now, there are many Moon Griffons across our Nation. Someone said, kind of as a wag, but I think there is a ring of truth to it, that ObamaCare, the individual exchange, only works if you don't because if you do work and you don't qualify for a subsidy, then you cannot afford it.

By the way, I think there is bipartisan agreement on this. Senator BERNIE SANDERS is now putting forward what we would call BernieCare, a single-payer proposal. He would not be putting that forward if he thought the

status quo is working. He is putting it forward because he realizes it is not. He has 16 cosponsors, if you will. Cosponsors are a testament to the fact that the status quo is not working. Well, I can tell you, since Medicare is going bankrupt in 17 years, the seniors who are on it will have their benefits threatened by adding another 150 million more Americans to the program. Those who have employer-sponsored insurance, I don't think they will want to give up their employer-sponsored insurance and trust in BernieCare.

So our last hope, we think, is relieving folks from the burdens of the Affordable Care Act in a way that preserves President Trump's goals of caring for all, taking care of those with preexisting conditions, covering all, lowering premiums, and eliminating mandates.

We have the basis of an approach. This past week, the HELP Committee has been having hearings, as well as the Finance Committee. Both Democratic and Republican Governors, insurance commissioners, stakeholders of other sorts, Medicaid directors, and all, whether Democratic or Republican, Governor or Medicaid director or insurance Commissioner, have said that if we give the States the flexibility to come up with their own solutions, they will find solutions that work better for their State than the Affordable Care Act—and it makes total sense. Clearly, Alaska is different than Rhode Island. Louisiana is different than Missouri. If we can come up with solutions specific for each State, as opposed to a one-size-fits-all that comes out of Washington, DC, these Governors, Medicaid directors, and insurance commissioners of both parties think we can do a better job.

We have a model of this. The Children's Health Insurance Program, also known as the CHIP program, has been very successful. It works on a block grant that comes down to States. States pull down the dollars. They can roll over money for 2 years, and they provide a policy for the children in their State. There are certain criteria and safeguards regarding what that policy must look like.

In fact, Senator RON WYDEN, last night, finished up his remarks praising the CHIP program, that it was reauthorized and what a victory for the health of children because this is a program that will work. There is a little irony there, as Senator WYDEN had just finished criticizing the Graham-Cassidy-Heller amendment, which is patterned after the CHIP program. The irony, of course, is that he says our amendment will not work, and then he goes on to praise the program through which the money will flow and after which it is patterned.

What we do through the program is take the dollars going to States currently through the Affordable Care Act, and we pool them together and deliver them to States in a block grant, very similar and, indeed, through the CHIP program. Along that way, we equalize how much each American receives toward her care, irrespective of where she lives.

Why do I say that? Right now, 37 percent of the revenue from the Affordable Care Act goes to Americans in four States—37 percent of the revenue goes to those who live within four States. That is frankly not fair. I have nothing against those four States, but I don't see why a lower income American in Mississippi should receive so much less than a lower income American in Massachusetts or why someone in Arizona should be treated differently than someone in New York. I think we should equalize that treatment. Americans think that is fair. We do that with Medicare and Social Security and other popular programs. It is something we should do, as well, as we attempt to provide insurance for all to achieve President Trump's goals.

One example of this, by the way—Pennsylvania has twice the population of Massachusetts. Both of those States expanded Medicaid. Massachusetts gets 58 percent more money than does Pennsylvania. Again, Pennsylvania has twice the population of Massachusetts, but Massachusetts gets 58 percent more money. Both Northeastern States have cities with a high cost of living, but somehow Massachusetts does that much better.

Our goal, though, is through this grant that goes through the CHIP program—which Senators like Senator WYDEN have praised, and rightfully so, as being an effective program for improving health, with safeguards needed to make sure the money is used wisely and that all States and all residents within those States will receive about the same amount of money toward their healthcare. This would be, if you will, not a Democratic plan, not a Republican plan but an American plan, in which Senators vote to trust the people in their State over a Washington bureaucrat.

We have critics who don't understand our bill. It is a partisan bill, we are told.

No. If you look at the residents of the States who do better under our plan, it includes States represented by Democratic Senators. Virginia does far better because they will get the dollars they currently do not—as do Floridians, represented by a Democratic Senator; Missouri does, represented by the Presiding Officer now but also by a Democratic Senator; and others that are represented by Democratic Senators, but the lower income Americans in those States actually have resources they currently do not have. Indeed, I implore those Senators not to vote a party line but rather to vote for those lower income Americans in their States so they can have the resources needed for their better health.

I will conclude by saying one more time: We have one more chance. On the Democratic and Republican sides, we recognize that the Affordable Care Act is unsustainable. On the Republican side, we want to give power back to the patients, back to the States, fulfilling the wish of those Democratic and Republican Governors, insurance commissioners, and Medicaid directors to give them the flexibility to do what they wish to do.

The Democratic vision, BernieCare, if you will, of which he has 16 cosponsors, is to consolidate every decision in Washington, DC. As for me, I will vote with the States, I will vote with the people, and I will vote with the wisdom of the average American as opposed to the benign ''we know better than you'' attitude of Washington, DC.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, is this a partisan approach to healthcare? I don't think so, if Missouri does better. There is a Democrat representing Missouri. There is a Republican representing Missouri. Here is the good news. We got the Republican on board. We appreciate the Republican.

Let me tell you how this works.

I like Massachusetts, I like Maryland, I like New York, I like California, but I don't like them that much to give them a bunch of money that the rest of us will not get.

If you live in Massachusetts, you don't get twice the Social Security or 50 percent more than if you live in Pennsylvania. How can this happen? ObamaCare, for whatever reason, favors four blue States against the rest of us.

Now, our friends in Mississippi, like South Carolina—we have a 31-percent African-American population in South Carolina—I think the highest in the country is Mississippi. Under this block grant approach, our friends in Mississippi get a 900-percent increase. How can that be? Well, that is money that was going someplace else other than Mississippi.

So what have we learned about ObamaCare? Rural poor, particularly African Americans, don't do so well. These four States—New York, California, Massachusetts, and Maryland, they have a lot of high wage earners.

We have some rural poor States. Missouri is a very wonderful State, with big cities and rural areas. How do you get more money? Well, under this formula, you are getting money that would have gone to the four other States. So 50 to 138 percent of poverty, and there are 45 million people in America who fall in that demographic. We can figure out how many live in Missouri. We use that as the basis for the formula. You are not limited to spending the money on 50 to 138 percent of poverty, but that seems to be a fair way to redistribute the money. By 2026, the goal is, no matter where you live, Missouri, South Carolina, or California, you are going to get the same basic contribution from the Federal Government, regardless of where you

live. What a novel idea. That means places like Missouri and South Carolina do better.

To our friends in New York and California, we are giving you a long time to come down. To our friends in Massachusetts—and we have a great Republican Governor—I don't know how to explain the system where you get that much more money than everybody else. The goal is for you to have time to adjust, become more efficient, and Charlie Baker can do this.

Is it unfair for people like me, and Louisiana and Missouri, to say: No four States should get twice the amount of money for their population. I am trying to fix the problem in ObamaCare.

Who should get the money is another question. Should some bureaucrat you will never meet in Washington be in charge of your healthcare or should somebody you actually know and vote for be in charge of your healthcare?

The block grant has a beautiful concept to it. The people we empower, you actually live with them, and you vote for them. If you don't like ObamaCare and, God knows, if you don't like BernieCare, whom do you complain to?

You can tell me: I don't like ObamaCare. My premiums have gone up. My deductibles are going through the roof. You can complain to me all day long, and I will call somebody up who could care less what I think.

Now, if you have South Carolina responsible for the money instead of some bureaucrat in Washington, let me tell you what would happen. You would call me up, say: Hey, listen, this is not working for my family. I will find out who the statehouse person is, and we will call them together, and I guarantee you the Governor will listen to you because the Governor wants you to vote for him or her.

The bottom line is, the concept of who should be in charge of your healthcare is what this is all about.

Our friends on the other side deserve a great compliment. You know where you are going on healthcare. You have a plan to get there. I just don't agree with your plan, and I don't agree with where you are taking the country. But I will say this for you: You have a plan. I will say this to my Democratic colleagues: When it comes to your ideas, you fight like tigers.

I remember voting on ObamaCare on Christmas Eve, for God's sake, and we would have been here on Christmas Day if that is what it would have taken for Harry Reid to have passed ObamaCare.

Now, on our side, have we done everything we can to repeal ObamaCare? They did everything they could to pass it.

President Trump is now behind this bill.

Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate it very much. Without your voice, we cannot succeed. With your voice, we will be successful, but it is going to take more than a letter. Get on the phone. Start calling people. Obama did.

Senator MCCONNELL was very good today at lunch, saying that this is a good idea and that we need to get behind it.

A CBO score is necessary. I am sure there are a lot of good people at the CBO, but if I had one place to go before I died, it would be at the CBO because you live a long time. We need to get the CBO to score things in a timely fashion.

To my friends at the CBO, this is a block grant. We are going to spend $1.2 trillion in the next decade—not more, not less. I didn't do that well in math, but I can figure out how much we are going to spend. I don't mean to be super critical, but we have not had scores on the Portman language or on the Cruz language in 8 weeks.

Let me tell my Republican friends, if you are upset about our not successfully repealing and replacing ObamaCare after 7 years, count me in. We tried, and we were one vote short. We have 17 days left. What would the Democrats have done? They would have been fighting. There would have been no August break. We would have been right here on this floor. We would have been arguing about their view of healthcare.

So I am encouraged that our leadership is going to push the CBO and get behind this bill. I am encouraged that the President came out for the bill. The Vice President, above all others in the administration, has been on the phone, calling Governors. We have over 15 Governors now on the Republican side who are saying: Give me the money. Give me the power. I can do a better job than some bureaucrat in Washington.

To the other Republican Governors, check it out for your States, but here is what I would ask you to consider. The money that you are getting from ObamaCare is unsustainable. It is a false promise. It is going to collapse. We can never match that system because that system is unsustainable, and it is going to fail.

What have I learned about Republican Governors? Most of them practice what they preach, and some of them have been hard to get on board. It is almost like crack cocaine, in terms of ObamaCare dollars.

I am telling you right now, Republican Governors and Democratic Governors, that this system is going to collapse in Washington. There is not enough money to keep it afloat, and I am not going to spend good money after bad. This is a chance for you, at the State level, to have control over funds and for us to be as flexible as we possibly can be in our designing systems that make sense for your States. If California wants to go to single-payer healthcare, it can. If it wants to reimpose the employer mandate and the individual mandate, it can. We will repeal the individual mandate and the employer mandate for the country at large, but if you want to put it back in place, you can.

Here is the good news. California cannot take the rest of us down the tubes with them, and we will have the debate in California about what works and what does not.

Give South Carolina, Louisiana, and Missouri the space they need to design healthcare based on their individual demographics. You cannot spend the money on football stadiums. You have to spend it on healthcare. You have to take care of people who are sick. There are guardrails around this block grant, but innovation will flourish.

Under ObamaCare, where is the incentive to be innovative? All you need to do is print more money. Under BernieCare, there is zero incentive to be creative. Just tax the rich. This is what happens. We go from four States getting 30-something percent of the money and representing 20 percent of the population to where, basically, everybody gets the same.

Let's talk about Medicaid. BERNIE SANDERS, who is a good man with a good heart, is an avowed socialist. He is the most honest guy in this building. If you left it up to BERNIE, we would have a rowboat for a Navy, a gun for the Army, a prop plane for the Air Force, and everything else would be spent on entitlements. Most of us are not in that camp.

As to Medicaid, it is a program for low-income Americans to help them with their healthcare. There is a State match. Right now, we are spending almost $400 billion on Medicaid. By 2027, we are going to be spending over $650 billion. That is more than we spend on the military right now—with no end in sight.

So we do two things in this bill. We tell the States that we are going to give them more flexibility. This is what we spend on the military—$549 billion under sequestration. I hope that number goes up, but, by 2027, we are going to spend more money on Medicaid, let alone Medicare, than we do on the military. That is just unsustainable.

So what do we do?

We keep Medicaid in place as it is today. We try to give more flexibility because Indiana was a good example of what can happen if you give States the flexibility to help poor people. The one thing about Medicaid that I do not like is that, if you get a headache, you can ride to the emergency room, and we will pay a big Medicaid bill. I want to put Medicaid people into managed care. I want them to have some ownership over their healthcare. If you smoke, then that is something that ought to be considered in terms of cost. I like copayments. I want to treat fairly the people who are low-income and poor, but all of us need to be responsible for our healthcare.

Rather than having a Medicaid Program that just writes checks no matter what the outcomes are, we are going to, in year 8, begin to slow down the growth of Medicaid. It grows faster than medical inflation. Medical inflation is what it costs for you and your

family. Medicaid is way beyond that. Why? Because it is inefficient. We have proven at the State level that you can get a better bang for your buck from Medicaid.

The bottom line is that the first block grant begins to slow the growth of Medicaid to make it affordable for the rest of us and incentivize innovation in year 8.

If we do not do that, here is what will happen to the country. By 2038, all of the tax money that you send to Washington will go to pay the interest on the debt, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. There will not be one penny for the Department of Education or the Department of Defense. That is how quickly these programs are growing.

So we do two good things. We put Medicaid on a more sustainable path because it is an important program, and we allow flexibility in order to get better outcomes for the taxpayer and the patient. What a novel idea.

The second block grant is money that would have been spent by a bureaucrat in Washington. Under the first Republican proposal, you would get a refundable tax credit to go out and try to buy insurance somewhere, and we would give insurance companies money so that they would not collapse on the ObamaCare exchanges.

Instead of giving a refundable tax credit to an individual to buy a product that is going to go away because ObamaCare will not work and instead of giving a bunch of money to the insurance companies to prop them up, we are going to take that same amount of money and give it back to the States so that, by 2026, they will all get the same basic contribution.

Now, what did we do?

We repealed the individual mandate and the employer mandate. That is $250 billion in savings. The States can reimpose it if they would like. That is up to the States. We repealed the medical device tax because that hurts innovation. We left the other ObamaCare taxes in place. There is no more taking from the poor and giving to the rich. I wish that we would not have to do that, but we need the money to transition in a fair and sound way to a State-centric system.

To my friends on the other side, we leave the taxes in place. We just give the money to somebody else. It is called State control, local control, not Washington-based healthcare. We do it in a way in which, basically, everybody gets the same contribution from the Federal Government. What a novel idea.

Now, to President Trump, without you, we cannot do this. Your pen will be the one that signs the law if we can ever get it to your desk. You said today that you would veto BernieCare.

Let me tell everybody in America not to worry. Single-payer healthcare will never get through the Republican-controlled House, and we have the majority in the Senate.

Mr. President, we are not going to need you to veto single-payer healthcare. What we need you to do is to put in place a new system to stop the march toward single-payer healthcare because, if we do not change where we are going, the Federal Government is going to own it all from cradle to grave. On your watch, you can stop that.

Once we get the money and the power out of Washington, that will be the end of single-payer healthcare. Once people know that they have somebody to respond to their needs at the State level versus some bureaucrat they will never meet, there will be no going back to Washington-based healthcare.

President Trump, you have the chance in your first term to set us on a new path: healthcare that is closer to the patient, money based not on where you live but parity, and innovation versus bureaucracy. What a legacy it would be. For that to happen—and I know you are busy with hurricanes and North Korea—you are going to have to get on the phone, and you are going to have to help us sell this. I believe you will, and I know you can, and I am asking you to do it.

To Senator MCCONNELL, thank you for what you said today. Thank you for being willing to push this forward.

To my colleagues on this side, there are three options left for America: propping up ObamaCare, which will never work; BernieCare, which is full-blown single-payer healthcare; or this block grant approach.

I ask this question: Who are we, and what do we believe as Republicans? Our Democratic friends are pretty clear on who they are and what they believe when it comes to healthcare.

Here is what I believe. Send the money home. Send the money back to where the patient lives. Put it in the hands of doctors and hospitals in the communities and make sure that the people in the State are responsive to the needs of the individuals in that State. Replace a bureaucrat with an elected official. You will improve quality, and outcomes will be better, and it will be more fiscally sustainable.

At the end of the day, that Governor, whoever he or she might be, who can figure out quality healthcare in a sustainable fashion, will not only get reelected, but other people will copy what he does. If we leave the money and power here, there is never going to be any innovation. It is always going to be more money. Single-payer healthcare only works with a printing press—with unlimited dollars. Just keep printing the money. A block grant will bring out the best in America. It will create better outcomes for patients, and it will take us off the path of becoming Greece, because this is where we are headed.

Senator CASSIDY was a doctor in a low-income, nonprofit hospital. He knows more about this than I could ever hope to learn. There is a reason that I did not go to medical school. I could not get in. I just cannot tell you how impressed I have been with BILL CASSIDY's understanding of how healthcare works for average, everyday working people. He has dedicated his life to that segment of the population.

Rick Santorum. There would be no GRAHAM, CASSIDY, HELLER, JOHNSON without Rick. Rick said: LINDSEY, we did this with welfare reform. They said that we could not do it, but we block-granted the money and unleashed innovation at the State level, and not one dime of extra spending has occurred since 1996 because we were generous in the beginning. The Governors figured it out. It was a better way of dealing with the welfare population.

I had a bill to opt out of ObamaCare, and Rick said: Why don't you just do a block grant like we did with welfare reform. So, when you look at it, it is such an elegant, fair, commonsense solution to a complicated problem.

DEAN HELLER. DEAN HELLER is in the fight of his political life. A lot of people around here—and I understand it; I am included sometimes—just wish hard problems would go away. This is a tough business to be in. Dean was told by all of the experts—and he said this today—to just lay low. Do not get your fingerprints on this healthcare debate. There are no winners. Healthcare is too complicated. Just stay away from this fight. Lay low.

DEAN told us today in the conference: I didn't get elected to lay low. If we don't now get healthcare right, all of us are going to pay later. So DEAN HELLER, who is in one of the most competitive seats in the country, said: Sign me up.

Nevada gets 30 percent more money under this formula. It gets more control than ObamaCare would ever give them. DEAN HELLER believes that Medicaid is worth saving and that this is a way to save it. With the second block grant, 20 percent can be used to help traditional Medicaid.

The bottom line is that DEAN HELLER stood up today and said: Nobody in this conference has a tougher race than I do. Count me in because this is the right thing to do.

RON JOHNSON. If there were ever a ''Mr. Smith Goes to Washington,'' it is RON JOHNSON. This is his last term. If you want to have an interesting evening, do not go to dinner with RON JOHNSON and BILL CASSIDY. They are wonderful people, but they know numbers, and they love to talk about details and how systems work. RON JOHNSON has brought energy and a can-do attitude to this debate. He is the closest thing that I have seen in a long time to ''Mr. Smith Goes to Washington.'' He is not going to run again. He is doing what he thinks is best for Wisconsin and the Nation.

Scott Walker. If it were not for Scott Walker, we would not be here today. Scott Walker said: I have been talking about federalism all of my political life, and this is the first time that I have seen somebody in Washington try

to empower me here since welfare reform.

Scott Walker has been the moving force on the Governors' side.

As for the Governor of Utah, Mike, you should be proud of him. He is a really great guy. Mike, thank you for working with us to make this as flexible as possible.

Senator LEE has really driven this very hard in order to give as much flexibility to the State level as possible.

Thank you. Your Governor has been just absolutely awesome.

Asa Hutchinson in Arkansas stepped up. Our good friend Governor Bryant in Mississippi is all in. I could go on and on and on.

I know JOHN MCCAIN likes the concept of the block grant. JOHN MCCAIN wants to reform healthcare. He knows what happens to Arizona under ObamaCare, and this is our last, best chance to stop what I think is a march toward single-payer healthcare. I hope we can find a way to get our friends in Arizona at the State level on board because ObamaCare is failing your State. If we don't find a replacement—and I think this is a great replacement for the people of Arizona—everything is going to collapse.

So to all of those on the staff who have spent hours and hours and hours listening to us change our minds, do it one way, do it another: Thank you, thank you, thank you.

I have been in politics now—I came in a little bit before the Presiding Officer in the Senate. I have worked on a lot of things. I have had a lot of fun, a lot of disappointments. I don't think I have worked on anything more important than this. It has been fun. It has been frustrating.

I believe this is our last, best chance to get healthcare on a sustainable footing and to stop the march toward single-payer healthcare, which I believe with all my heart will reduce quality and explode costs, and that doesn't have to be the choice.

To my Republican friends: They know what they are for. Do we know what we are for? They are committed to their causes. Are we equally committed to ours? I hope the answer is yes. And if we can get 50 of us here, I will make a prediction. A few of them over there are going to sign on because their State does so well. There are some Democratic Senators who are my dear friends who are going to have to turn down more money and more power for their State to keep the status quo.

I can tell my colleagues this about bipartisanship. I am a pretty big believer in bipartisanship. I have taken my fair share of beatings—working on immigration; I believe climate change is real. I have done deals, and I understand that you have to work together. But our friends on the other side are never going to vote for anything that fundamentally repeals and replaces ObamaCare. They just can't do it. They are not bad people; they are just locked into a different way. And their way is that the government makes these decisions, not the private sector. My belief is that healthcare closer to the patient, like government, is better healthcare.

This is the last, best chance we will have to stop the march toward single-payer healthcare.

Mr. President, we need you. We need the weight of your office and the strength of your voice.

Senator MCCONNELL, thank you for what you said today, but all hands on deck. Our friends on the other side moved Heaven and Earth to pass ObamaCare. I am going to do everything I can to repeal ObamaCare and replace it with something that is not good for Republicans but is good for Americans, because many Democratic States, including Illinois, do far better under this approach than under ObamaCare, and all of us will do better than BernieCare. If we don't stop this now, single-payer healthcare is the fate of the Nation.

To all who have been involved, thank you very much. We can do this. We have the time. Do we have the will?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes about an amendment I have offered to the National Defense Authorization Act. The name of this amendment is the Due Process Guarantee Act.

Alexander Hamilton, writing in Federalist No. 84, called arbitrary imprisonment one of the ''favorite and most formidable instruments of tyrants.'' The Constitution includes safeguards against this form of tyranny, including the right of habeas corpus and the guarantee that American citizens will not be deprived of life, liberty, or property by the government without due process of law. Our commitment to these rights is tested from time to time. It is most tested in times of crisis. We have not always passed these tests.

During the Second World War, President Franklin D. Roosevelt unilaterally authorized the internment of over 100,000 Japanese Americans for fear they would spy against the United States. The government presented no evidence that these Americans posed any threat to their country because the government had no evidence. Most of the detainees were themselves native-born citizens of the United States of America. Many had never even visited Japan during their entire lives. That episode in our Nation's history is sadly personal to the State I represent. The U.S. Government unjustly detained thousands of Japanese Americans in Utah at the Topaz War Relocation Center.

Japanese-American internment is the most dramatic and shameful instance of detention in our Nation's history, but it is far from the only instance. In 1950, in a climate of intense fear about Communist infiltration of government, Congress enacted the McCarran Internal Security Act over the veto of President Harry Truman. That law contained an emergency provision allowing the President to detain any person he felt might spy on the United States.

More recently than that, in the post-9/11 era, there has been renewed pressure to diminish our constitutional protections in the name of security. Lawmakers from both parties have authorized the detention of Americans suspected of terrorism without charge, without trial, and without meeting the evidentiary standard required for every other crime—potentially for life. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, Congress authorized the indefinite military detention of suspected terrorists, including American citizens arrested on American soil.

These episodes—Japanese-American internment, the McCarran Internal Security Act, and the NDAA for 2012—are teachable moments, if you will. In all three cases, the United States faced real threats from totalitarian foes—foes hostile to our very core values and ideals as a nation. But instead of defying our foes by holding fast to our core values, we jettisoned them in a panic. Fear and secrecy won out. The Constitution and constitutional values lost.

Thankfully, that isn't the whole story, for there have also been times when Americans have stood up for the Constitution in the face of threats, thus sending a strong message to the totalitarian forces arrayed against us. For instance, in 1971 Congress passed the Non-Detention Act, stating that ''[n]o citizen shall be imprisoned or otherwise detained by the United States except pursuant to an Act of Congress.''

Congress can make another stand for the Constitution by allowing a vote on the bipartisan Due Process Guarantee Act, by correcting the mistake—the very same mistake—it made in the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2012 and protecting Americans from indefinite detention by government.

What, one might ask, is the Due Process Guarantee Act? In short, the amendment would raise the bar that the government has to clear in order to indefinitely detain American citizens and lawful permanent residents who are apprehended on U.S. soil. It would forbid the government from justifying such detentions using general authorizations for the use of military force, such as the 2001 AUMF against the 9/11 plotters. Instead, the government would have to obtain explicit, written approval from Congress before taking such action with regard to Americans if they are detained within the United States.

The Due Process Guarantee Act is based on a simple premise: If the government wants to take the extraordinary step of apprehending Americans on U.S. soil without charge or trial, it has to get extraordinary permission and should, at a bare minimum, require

an express act of Congress authorizing such extraordinary action. And if my colleagues want to grant the government this power over their constituents, they should authorize it themselves; they shouldn't hide behind vague authorizations so the voting public doesn't know what they are doing.

This begs the question whether we would ever want to do this—whether we should ever do it. It is difficult for many of us to imagine any circumstance in which anyone would want to authorize such extraordinary action, but that is exactly the point—the point contemplated by the suspension clause in the U.S. Constitution. If something like that is going to be done, Congress needs to do it and needs to do it expressly and identify exactly what the threat, the war, the insurrection is that is being addressed.

I am offering this amendment because of my faith in our law enforcement officers and judges. And I have great faith in those people who fill those roles in our country, who have successfully apprehended and prosecuted many homegrown terrorists. Their example to us proves that our security is not dependent on a supercharged government and a weakened constitution.

Moreover, we must remember that our security and our privacy are not necessarily at odds with each other. Indeed, our privacy is part of our security. It is part of what makes us secure. We can secure the homeland without using the formidable instruments of tyrants.

It is with this objective in mind that I propose to my colleagues and request the support of my colleagues for the Due Process Guarantee Act, which should be adopted so as to make sure we are both free and safe, while remaining secure.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding rule XXII, that at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, September 18, the McCain amendment No. 545 be withdrawn, the Senate adopt the McCain substitute amendment No. 1003, as modified, and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.R. 2810; further, that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 280, 281, 283, 284, 285, 286, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, and 310.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Peter E. Deegan, Jr., of Iowa, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Iowa for the term of four years; Marc Krickbaum, of Iowa, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Iowa for the term of four years; D. Michael Dunavant, of Tennessee, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Tennessee for the term of four years; Louis V. Franklin, Sr., of Alabama, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Alabama for the term of four years; Jessie K. Liu, of Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the District of Columbia for the term of four years; Richard W. Moore, of Alabama, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Alabama for the term of four years; Bart M. Davis, of Idaho, to be United States Attorney for the District of Idaho for the term of four years; Kurt G. Alme, of Montana, to be United States Attorney for the District of Montana for the term of four years; Donald Q. Cochran, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Tennessee for the term of four years; Russell M. Coleman, of Kentucky, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years; Brian J. Kuester, of Oklahoma, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for the term of four years; R. Trent Shores, of Oklahoma, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Oklahoma for the term of four years; and Daniel J. Kaniewski, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Administrator for National Preparedness, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order, and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Deegan, Krickbaum, Dunavant, Franklin, Liu, Moore, Davis, Alme, Cochran, Coleman, Kuester, Shores, and Kaniewski nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING PETE DOMENICI

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes amidst the Senate's business to memorialize my good friend, fellow colleague, and long-serving Senator of New Mexico, Pete Domenici. It is altogether fitting that we may offer tribute right in the middle of a busy day. Pete was a true legislator, the kind we just don't see all that often any longer. He was at his best when we were here getting things done—and often we were getting things done because of his efforts. He will be sorely missed by those of us who had the distinct privilege of serving alongside him.

Pete's life was a testament to the American Dream; born to immigrant parents, Pete grew up working in his father's store before going on to earn his degree in education. Later, he would teach math at a local junior high school, before making his way into city politics and, from there, join the Senate in 1972. Some will no doubt recall that he was the first Republican elected as Senator of New Mexico in nearly 40 years, but most will remember that he always put the people of his State and his Nation ahead of partisan interests.

While serving in the Senate, Pete fulfilled his charge with diligence, passion, and decorum. His time here still serves as an example to many of us. Pete was regularly willing to reach across the aisle, always willing to take the first step, and never one to shrink from an opportunity presented, whether difficult or not. Pete's efforts to bring the Federal budget under control were especially admirable, and his leadership was crucial in achieving the balanced budget of 1997. That has proven a rare accomplishment. His work as an advocate for the mentally ill showed

his deep levels of compassion, and his efforts helped create a more just and equitable society for all.

Even after he retired, Pete, as was his way, refused to rest. He continued to promote bipartisan solutions in Washington and continued to remind each of us of our duties to the American people. My prayers and condolences go out to his wife, Nancy, and all of his family. Amidst their grief, I take heart they may know that his legacy outlives his days and that this body will be forever better for his service.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week, we mourn the loss of Pete Domenici, a former Senate colleague, a respected and leading voice in bipartisanship, and, most of all, a friend.

Pete had the distinction of being the longest serving Senator in New Mexico's history. He spent almost half a century as a public servant.

Most knew Pete for his outspokenness on energy and budget issues, but I remember him best for his commitment and dedication on behalf of Americans struggling with mental illness.

In 2008, two Senators—Paul Wellstone, a liberal Democrat from Minnesota, and Pete Domenici, a conservative Republican from New Mexico—came together to pass legislation that prohibited health insurance companies from treating mental health differently from physical health benefits.

The Wellstone-Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act finally set mental health and substance abuse benefits on equal footing with other health benefits, ensuring fairness in deductibles, copayments, provider networks, and lifetime limits.

Those two Senators couldn't have been more different, but they each had family members who were touched by mental illness.

Pete Domenici and Paul Wellstone asked, Why should we treat illnesses of the brain any different than a cancer, diabetes, or heart disease?

That shared bond brought them together. It is why they spent years fighting with insurance companies about the importance of mental health coverage and ultimately got a law passed.

The Wellstone-Domenici Parity Act laid the groundwork for so much of what we fought for in the Affordable Care Act: the idea that people should have access to coverage, regardless of what their medical needs are.

You see, the ACA built off this law by requiring that all individual market insurance plans cover mental health and substance abuse services as an ''essential health benefit.''

Thanks to Pete's hard work, millions of Americans no longer have to fight for mental health benefits or addiction treatment benefits, so important in the face of today's opioid crisis.

Pete taught us that mental illness is exactly that—an illness—and that those who suffer from any illness deserve equal rights and access to care.

Senator Domenici was also a strong advocate for immigration reform.

Back in 2002, he signed on as a cosponsor of the original DREAM Act, legislation that I introduced to give a path to citizenship to talented young immigrants who grew up in the country.

As the son of an Italian immigrant mother and an Italian-born father who earned citizenship after his service in WWI, Pete understood firsthand the immigrant experience.

He once said, ''I understand this whole idea of a household with a father who is American and a mother who is not, but they are living, working, and getting ahead. I understand that they are just like every other family in America. There is nothing different. They have the same love, same hope, same will and same aspirations as those of us who were born here have.''

Pete didn't just talk; he put his money where his mouth was.

In 2006, he voted for the McCain-Kennedy comprehensive immigration reform bill that included the DREAM Act.

It passed the Republican-controlled Senate on a strong bipartisan vote, but unfortunately, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives never brought it to a vote.

Senator Domenici's work in the Senate is a great example of the good that can come from bipartisanship—of what can happen when we start working together to get something done for the American public.

It is my hope that we can carry on Pete's legacy of equal rights for all through bipartisan means.

My condolences to the Domenici family and thank you for sharing such an earnest man with us.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor former Senator Pete V. Domenici of New Mexico, who passed away September 13 in Albuquerque. It was a privilege to call Pete a friend and to work with him as a Senate colleague and member of the Appropriations Committee.

Senator Domenici had a great ability to bring people together to work on solutions to complicated challenges like the budget deficit, national security, and energy policy. His passing closes the book on a life well-lived as a public servant dedicated to his family, his State, and our Nation.

My condolences go out to his lovely wife, Nancy, and their family.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for yesterday's vote on the motion to table Senate amendment No. 871 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act, to repeal existing authorizations for the use of military force. I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for today's vote on the motion to invoke cloture on substitute amendment No. 1003 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act. I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for today's vote on Calendar No. 109, confirmation of the nomination of Pamela Hughes Patenaude to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. I would have voted yea.•

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote No. 197, the motion to invoke cloture on McCain-Reed amendment No. 1003, as modified, the substitute to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.•

NORTH KOREA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to address one of the most pressing and most challenging national security issues facing our Nation: North Korea's growing nuclear and ballistic missile programs and its continued belligerent behavior.

North Korea has developed an active nuclear weapons program and is making considerable progress in developing nuclear-capable ballistic missiles that can reach our allies and partners in the region, including South Korea and Japan, U.S. territories like Guam, and, likely, the continental United States as well.

The time for illusions about North Korea's programs, or wishful thinking about our policy options, is past.

With each passing day, North Korea's continued defiance of the international community makes it clear that the Trump administration's policy of maximum pressure is yielding minimal results.

If the United States continues on the path laid out by President Trump, there are only two realistic outcomes, both bad: North Korea becomes a nuclear power or a large-scale conventional war breaks out on the Korean Peninsula that would result in the loss of hundreds of thousands and possibly millions of lives.

If our policy options leave us with only capitulation or war as possible outcomes, those policies are deeply flawed. There should be a lot of space between war and capitulation on the Korean Peninsula.

I strongly believe that we must therefore adjust our strategy to fill that space with an all-out ''diplomatic surge,'' one that results in serious, hard constraints on North Korea's nuclear ambitions and a more peaceful, stable, and prosperous Northeast Asia for all.

The initial objective of this surge would be to begin a diplomatic process, with Pyongyang first verifiably halting

their nuclear and ballistic missile testing and the United States and our allies taking steps to deescalate the current tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

We have not arrived at the current situation with North Korea overnight. Where we are today is an outgrowth of two decades of steady progress by North Korea's nuclear and ballistic programs. The tense situation on the Korean Peninsula highlights the failure of the international community and multiple administrations, Republican and Democratic alike, to end North Korea's nuclear and missile programs and to promote greater security and stability in the region.

This year alone, North Korea has conducted at least a dozen ballistic missile tests, including ICBM tests, and now a nuclear test of what is likely a thermonuclear weapon.

We may not like this reality, but we must face the fact that North Korea already has a small but nonetheless operational nuclear arsenal.

At this critical moment, the President, instead of providing responsible leadership, has engaged in bluster and provocative statements about nuclear war with North Korea. He continues to show he lacks the temperament and judgment to deal with this serious crisis. He continues to increase tensions rather than reduce them and to issue threats when it is far from clear he is willing to back them up.

President Trump's dangerous rhetoric has painted the United States into a corner.

The President has zig-zagged from one extreme to the other, as the Washington Post recently put it, veering between bellicose tweets aimed at North Korea, threats to our allies and partners, efforts to flatter Beijing, offers of diplomacy, and then strident rejections of it at the same time. He has created an environment of uncertainty amongst our allies and partners, emboldened our adversaries, and confused and deeply concerned the American people about their safety.

I therefore feel a solemn responsibility as the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to put forward an approach to North Korea that I believe represents the type of responsible bipartisan leadership the world has come to expect from the United States.

When the United States leads with our values and interests at the fore, others follow, but when we abdicate or purposefully cause doubt, well, that kind of uncertainty makes the world less safe.

Therefore, the United States should put its full weight into creating and executing a comprehensive policy that includes the immediate imposition of additional sanctions, active engagement with our allies, vigorous support for human rights and the pursuit of principled multilateral measures to shape the regional environment.

Most urgently, we should begin immediate and direct diplomatic engagement with Pyongyang, guided by strategic clarity, to curtail North Korea's nuclear ambitions, protect our allies, and bring stability to the Korean Peninsula.

Underlying our current North Korea policy—or lack thereof—are a series of assumptions, which I believe must be reconsidered in light of our decades-long failure to achieve our strategic objectives.

First, will China, ever really ''carry our water'' on economic sanctions?

My assessment is China prioritizes its own interests in maintaining North Korea stability over denuclearization and will never place enough pressure on North Korea to force them to give up their nuclear program. That said, and as I will discuss further, China has a crucial role to play as a partner in this process, both imposing costs on North Korea up front and providing security and economic guarantees on the back end, but we should not expect that China will solve this issue for us.

Second, do we still think that North Korea wants and needs to rejoin the international community?

In other words, do they need us more than we need them? Based on its current actions, one would have to conclude no—and that holding out that possibility is not in fact an incentive for Pyongyang because it does not interest them.

We should also be clear about North Korean intentions. Indeed, for all the talk about how irrational and unpredictable North Korea is, they have pursued these weapons—and developed tactics to evade international sanctions and pressure—with clarity and determination. They have not hid their intentions, the reasons why they believe they are seeking these weapons, or their vision for the peninsula.

Even so, I believe Pyongyang will respond to incentives and to pressure, but we must get both the pressure and the disincentives right to be effective.

Third, is time still on our side?

The regime continues to move forward with its nuclear and missile programs, defying consistent predictions since the end of the Cold War that North Korea was on the verge of immediate collapse. All signs indicating that Kim Jung-Un is firmly in control and faces no serious challenges. He has even had members of his own family murdered to keep his iron grip on the country firm and in place. So while time has not run out, it is not on our side, either.

Finally, are negotiations with North Korea pointless because they will always renege on their commitments?

I recognize the history of numerous efforts to engage with North Korea that have ended in failure and acrimony, but it is also important to remember that while the 1994 framework agreement had many problems, it did limit and constrain North Korea's stockpile of plutonium for an 8-year period.

Yes, North Korea continued with a part of its nuclear programs in secret, but there is no question that, during this period, the United States and our allies were safer and more secure than they would have been given the alternatives, which were war or acquiesce to North Korea's nuclear program.

While it is certainly possible that the agreed framework would have fallen apart regardless, it is also possible, if the agreement had been maintained, it would have provided options for bringing the North's nuclear ambitions to a more permanent end.

So while the Agreed Framework was far from perfect, it does suggest there are pathways by which a diplomatic surge can succeed in constraining and binding North Korea and in creating a more stable security environment in the region.

I want to be very clear—I have no illusions about North Korea or about the low chances of success for even the best strategy for dealing with this regime.

Nevertheless, it is incumbent on those of us in Congress, as well as our colleagues in the executive branch, to think through a policy that gives us the best chance of success and to take the necessary steps to see if this approach might lead to a better outcome.

So, what would a policy geared for success with North Korea look like?

First, we must immediately begin a sustained diplomatic effort with the goal of first constraining and then ultimately eliminating Pyongyang's nuclear and missile programs. Working with China is critical to these efforts.

We can't expect China to solve North Korea for us. However, that does not mean that there is no space to make common cause with Beijing to contain North Korean's nuclear and missile programs and thereby reduce tensions in East Asia, which would benefit our mutual national security interests.

At the end of the day, China understands that it, too, benefits from a denuclearized peninsula and that increased military tensions in the region, let alone war, do not serve China's interests well. So we can work with China to assure that sanctions are fully implemented—especially those which China has already signed up for at the United Nations but has been slow to bring into force, an immediate test being the unanimously passed Security Council sanctions just this week. We can encourage China to take necessary measures that can force Pyongyang back to the negotiating table.

To make this strategy work, we must indicate to China and Russia that we are ready and willing to engage in negotiations with North Korea.

As we turn the screws on North Korea and strengthen our alliances, we need to be open to wide-ranging talks. We should be willing to discuss measures to deescalate the conflict on the Korean Peninsula, ways to improve the lot of the downtrodden people of North Korea, and ultimately a pathway forward for a denuclearized Korean Peninsula.

To begin this process, Pyongyang will first have to verifiably halt their nuclear and ballistic missile testing, and the United States and our allies must indicate a willingness to take steps to deescalate the current tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

China's assistance will be necessary not only in getting talks started but also in helping them reach a successful conclusion. Only China can provide North Korea with certain kinds of security guarantees which likely will be necessary to enhance Pyongyang's confidence that any agreement will be enduring.

Second, it is worth emphasizing that an ''America Alone'' approach is not a formula for success in dealing with North Korea—or anything else for that matter. A complex threat like North Korea can't be successfully confronted without assistance from our allies and partners in the region—and any successful approach must start by strengthening our alliances and partnerships with Japan and Korea.

The scope and range of partnership with our allies—starting with Japan and Korea—is both dynamic and comprehensive and has been critical for maintaining peace, stability, and economic prosperity throughout the Asia-Pacific region.

This stability and prosperity has also made the United States more secure and more prosperous. It is why the United States, after the devastation of the Second World War and the Korean war, built partnerships with Japan, South Korea, and other Asian nations. These actions turned the region into one of the greatest foreign policy success stories of the past 70 years. Any successful policy toward North Korea must be built on this foundation and recognize that our strategic alliances combine not just military but also diplomatic and economic elements.

The election of Moon Jae-in as President of South Korea and our partnership with Prime Minister Abe in Japan have created new opportunities to reconsider and recalibrate our approach and encourage us to align and coordinate our approach with that of our regional allies. Nations such as Australia, Singapore, and our other ASEAN partners also have important roles to play.

The United States has worked diligently for the past several years, starting under the Obama administration, to strengthen our alliances and partnerships in the region by enhancing our defense and deterrence capabilities in light of emerging North Korean threats. This has included missile defense, extended deterrence, counter-provocation planning, and a suite of other capabilities relevant to the new security environment.

We must continue and deepen these defense efforts to assure that we can stay ahead of North Korean threats, to provide leverage for diplomacy, and to maintain an insurance policy for the sort of ''containment'' that will be necessary should diplomacy fail.

Third, the United States has an important opportunity to set the broader regional context for peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula by engaging in forward-leaning, principled, multilateral diplomatic engagement.

Over the years, there have been numerous proposals for multilateral architecture in Northeast Asia proposed by the nations of the region, as well as by the United States.

While there is ample room for discussion and debate over which model might be best, it is clear we need a forum to draw the nations of Northeast Asia together to engage in confidence-building measures and to address outstanding diplomatic, security, and political issues so that the right context exists for a stable Korean Peninsula. When President Trump travels to Asia this November, he has an important opportunity to move the multilateral architecture debate forward as a necessary supporting element of a broader North Korea strategy.

Fourth and finally, the administration must seek to fully exercise our economic leverage, not incrementally but robustly and to the maximum extent feasible, and should immediately impose additional economic sanctions on Pyongyang.

Secondary sanctions imposed upon firms that trade with North Korea, along with other targeted sectoral and financial measures through the UN Security Council, are essential to make it more difficult for the Kim Jong Un regime to support its prohibited nuclear and missile programs, including the financing that fuels its illegal activities.

The administration must also rigorously implement and enforce the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enforcement Act of 2016, the relevant sections of the recently passed Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act and UNSC resolutions 2270 and 2321 on North Korea.

I know several of our colleagues, including Senators GARDNER, MARKEY, TOOMEY and VAN HOLLEN, also have legislation to impose new and additional sanctions.

Critically, while many past efforts have been targeted at imposing costs on North Korea by curtailing trade leaving North Korea, to be truly effective a sanctions regime must have as its primary purpose halting the flow of goods, finances, and material into North Korea. We know that when oil shipments have been curtailed in the past or when we threaten the ability of North Korea to use the international financial system to bring its ill-gotten funds home, we have gotten Pyongyang's attention.

We will get their attention again if we cut off North Korean elites' ability to continue to enjoy luxury goods. By cutting off access to these goods, through existing sanctions that are often not seriously enforced, we will provide an opportunity to focus minds in Pyongyang.

China plays a key role in bringing this sort of pressure to bear on North Korea, but so do others. Russia, for example, houses some 30,000 North Korean slave laborers, a key source of regime income, and has also supplied North Korea with oil and aviation fuel in the past, sometimes illicitly. Other partners, including Singapore, have been key hubs for North Korean activity. Robust implementation of current sanctions to address these activities is crucial across all members of the international community.

What I have laid out today are lofty goals to be sure, but we should stand up and try to reach them. Let's try to stop North Korea through diplomacy while watching to make sure North Korea will not cheat during negotiations or on any final agreement, as they have in the past.

While imperfect in the short term, a freeze on North Korea's nuclear and missile program serves our national security interests. If nothing is done to slow North Korea down, its nuclear program and delivery systems will continue to grow, imperiling our allies and the American people. Diplomatic engagement that allows us to constrain and eventually reverse North Korea's nuclear ambitions may not be ''perfect'' security, but it is enhanced security and by far the better option available.

Time is no longer on our side, but the clock hasn't run out yet. The United States and the international community have an opportunity to test the proposition of what a robust diplomatic surge to North Korea's aggression might look like. It is critical that we take the opportunity now.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT ''AL'' LEE

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, I have the distinct honor of recognizing Albert ''Al'' Lee of Forsyth. Al has made a lifetime of contributions to our State and our Nation. Al's experiences as a veteran, rancher, long-serving volunteer, and renowned shooting sports enthusiast have made him a highly respected member of his community in Rosebud County.

After finishing his military service with the U.S. Air Force during the Korean war, Al returned to Montana State University and married Sharon, a fellow Bobcat. Al and Sharon soon settled near the Yellowstone River and began operating the family ranch. Over the years, the Lee family has opened large sections of their ranch to the Boy Scouts, hunters, and to the participants of the Matthew Quigley Buffalo Rifle Match. The Matthew Quigley Buffalo Rifle Match recently completed its 26th annual competition in June. This prestigious shooting match has grown from a few dozen shooters the first year, to well over 600 shooters this year, including international competitors from six nations.

Al's love for shooting sports and his passion for sharing our Montana cultural traditions has been highly valued

at both the State and national levels. The Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks has honored Al for over five decades of volunteering to teach firearms safety to rising generations of future hunters. In 2001, The National Rifle Association recognized Al with their highly esteemed public service award.

Montana cowboys like Al Lee give a unique character to the Treasure State. Thank you, Al, for the many years of service and for strengthening our Montana traditions.●

RECOGNIZING PJM INTERCONNECTION

● Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, today I recognize the 90th anniversary of PJM Interconnection, which is the Nation's largest competitive wholesale electricity market.

Headquartered in Valley Forge, PA, PJM performs the critical function of supplying electricity to more than 65 million customers in 13 Midwestern, Mid-Atlantic, and Southern States and the District of Columbia.

PJM began in 1927 when three electric utilities joined together to connect their systems and form Pennsylvania-New Jersey Interconnection, the world's first continuing power pool. Additional utilities joined the coalition over the following decades, and in 1956, it became known as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland—PJM—Interconnection, the name used today. Around the same time, PJM expanded its use of new technology by installing its first online computer to control electric generation and later to monitor grid operations in real time, which led to improved reliability and better customer service.

PJM is also celebrating its 20th anniversary as an independent system operator, ISO. In 1997, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, approved PJM as the Nation's first fully functioning ISO, which operates but does not own electric transmission systems. Five years later, PJM became the first regional transmission organization in the country when FERC encouraged the formation of these entities to increase access to competitive wholesale energy markets. Over the past two decades, PJM has continued its focus on innovation and customer service by expanding utility membership, developing generating capacity, and diversifying its energy portfolio to include coal, natural gas, and nuclear.

In addition, PJM is recognized by its peers as a leader in the competitive wholesale electricity sector. The firm continues to focus on improving energy storage, grid technology, and demand response. PJM first provided wholesale electricity in 1927, and I am confident that PJM will continue its commitment to affordability, reliability, and customer service for the foreseeable future.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 12:38 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 joint resolution:

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the first responders who lost their lives while monitoring the events, offering deepest condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed and deepest sympathies and support to those individuals who were injured by the violence, expressing support for the Charlottesville community, rejecting White nationalists, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups, and urging the President and the President's Cabinet to use all available resources to address the threats posed by those groups.

The enrolled joint resolution was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 14, 2017, she had presented to the President of the United States the following joint resolution:

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the first responders who lost their lives while monitoring the events, offering deepest condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed and deepest sympathies and support to those individuals who were injured by the violence, expressing support for the Charlottesville community, rejecting White nationalists, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups, and urging the President and the President's Cabinet to use all available resources to address the threats posed by those groups.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1088. A bill to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–156).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1103. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department-wide guidance and to develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–157).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Robert P. Storch, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General of the National Security Agency.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ralph R. Erickson, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

Donald C. Coggins, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

Dabney Langhorne Friedrich, of California, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Stephen S. Schwartz, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Robert J. Higdon, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina for the term of four years.

J. Cody Hiland, of Arkansas, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas for the term of four years.

Joshua J. Minkler, of Indiana, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Indiana for the term of four years.

Byung J. Pak, of Georgia, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1805. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program to recognize farms that have been in continuous operation for 100 years; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr.

BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. REED, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1806. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 and the Head Start Act to promote child care and early learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1807. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a national strategic action plan and program to assist health professionals in preparing for and responding to the public health effects of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1808. A bill to extend temporarily the Federal Perkins Loan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. 1809. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish the Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) Challenge Grant Program to promote technological innovation in our Nation's cities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1810. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide access to free credit freezes for all consumers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1811. A bill to promote merger enforcement and protect competition through adjusting premerger filing fees, increasing antitrust enforcement resources, and improving the information provided to antitrust enforcers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1812. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to modify the standard for an unlawful acquisition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 1813. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide credit toward computation of years of service for nonregular service retired pay for completion of remotely delivered military education or training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1814. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1815. A bill to require data brokers to establish procedures to ensure the accuracy of collected personal information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1816. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to enhance fraud alert procedures and provide free access to credit freezes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1817. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENZI:

S. 1818. A bill to provide health care options for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1819. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer credit checks against prospective and current employees for the purposes of making adverse employment decisions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED):

S. 1820. A bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1821. A bill to establish the National Commission on the Cybersecurity of United States Election Systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1822. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit amounts paid for programs to obtain a recognized postsecondary credential or a license to be treated as qualified higher education expenses for purposes of a 529 account; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. Res. 255. A resolution congratulating the National Federation of Federal Employees on the celebration of the 100th anniversary of its founding and recognizing the vital contributions of its members to the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. RUBIO)):

S. Res. 256. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. Res. 257. A resolution designating September 16, 2017, as ''Isaac M. Wise Temple Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 258. A resolution designating the week beginning September 10, 2017, as ''National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 259. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of September 11 through September 15, 2017, as ''National Family Service Learning Week''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 194

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 194, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a public health insurance option, and for other purposes.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 360

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the use of telehealth for individuals with stroke.

S. 464

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota

(Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 464, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a permanent Independence at Home medical practice program under the Medicare program.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 683

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 683, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the requirement to provide nursing home care to certain veterans with service-connected disabilities.

S. 705

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 705, a bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 819

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 819, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 872

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 946, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1117

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1117, a bill to protect the investment choices of investors in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1146

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1146, a bill to enhance the ability of the Office of the National Ombudsman to assist small businesses in meeting regulatory requirements and develop outreach initiatives to promote awareness of the services the Office of the National Ombudsman provides, and for other purposes.

S. 1270

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1270, a bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 1591

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1591, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and for other purposes.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1718, a bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1742

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1742, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an option for any citizen or permanent resident of the United States age 55 to 64 to buy into Medicare.

S. 1774

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1774, a bill to provide protections for workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization.

S. 1782

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1782, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1783

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1783, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each State to implement a process under which individuals who are 16 years of age may apply to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, to direct the Election Assistance Commission to make grants to States to increase the involvement of minors in public election activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1786

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1786, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to enhance the accuracy of credit reporting and provide greater rights to consumers who dispute errors in their credit reports, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 426

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 426 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 510

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 510 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 558

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 558 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 607

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 607 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 670

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 670 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 714

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 714 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 768

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 768 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 770

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 770 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 803

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 803 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 819

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 819 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 879

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 879 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 900

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 900 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 909

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 909 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 938

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 938 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 939

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 939 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 942

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 942 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 967

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 967 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 999

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 999 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1004

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1004 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1017

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1017 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1027

At the request of Mr. STRANGE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1027 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1032

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1032 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1033

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1033 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1056

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1056 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1814. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. Far too many students leave our Country's classrooms ill-equipped to keep up with the demands of the 21st century job market. Many enter high school and postsecondary education uninformed of the range of careers available to them. For our Country's continued success, it is essential that our young people have exposure to the vast range of available work and career options early in their academic careers so that, by the time they begin high school, they are more knowledgeable about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them.

Wherever I travel through Virginia I hear the same thing from business owners, manufacturers, and plant managers: there are good paying jobs out there, we just need to train our students with the skills to fill them. Middle school is a time for students to begin thinking about what they want to pursue in life. Helping them explore how their coursework could support those interests can make a valuable difference down the road.

Programs that focus on career and technical education (CTE) allow for students to explore their own strengths and passions, as well as how they match up with potential future careers. But limited funding for middle school CTE programming often requires students to wait until high school for access to this type of experience.

This is why I am pleased to introduce today the Middle School Technical Education Program Act, or Middle STEP Act. This bipartisan legislation creates a pilot program that allows for middle schools to partner with colleges and local businesses to develop and implement CTE exploration programs that give students access to apprenticeships or project-based learning opportunities. Additionally, middle school CTE programs funded through the Middle STEP Act would give students access to career guidance and academic counseling to help them understand the educational requirements for high-growth, in-demand career fields. Programs would assist students in drafting a high school graduation plan that demonstrates what courses prepare them for a given career. The programs must also provide a clear transition path from the introductory middle school program to a more narrow focus of CTE study in high school, and must be accessible to students from economically disadvantaged, urban and rural communities.

I believe this meaningful legislation can propel young students toward the careers of the future, and help to fill workforce shortages across the Commonwealth and the Nation. I strongly encourage my colleagues to consider this legislation to allow for students to have opportunities to explore potential career choices and pathways early on in their academic careers. Their futures depend on it.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 255—CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ON THE CELEBRATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS FOUNDING AND RECOGNIZING THE VITAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF ITS MEMBERS TO THE UNITED STATES

Ms. HEITKAMP submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 255

Whereas the National Federation of Federal Employees (referred to in this preamble as the ''NFFE'') was created in 1917 as the first union in the United States to exclusively represent civil service Federal employees;

Whereas the NFFE preserves, promotes, and improves the rights and working conditions of Federal employees and other professionals through all lawful means, including collective bargaining, legislative activities, and contributing to civic and charitable organizations;

Whereas the contributions of the NFFE are noted in history through a century of achievements for the Federal labor movement, including numerous reforms to workforce policy and working conditions;

Whereas NFFE members serve the United States by performing critical functions throughout Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Federal Aviation Administration, the General Services Administration, the Indian Health Service, the Passport Service of the Bureau of Consular Affairs, and the Corps of Engineers;

Whereas, through a partnership with the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers and the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the NFFE promotes better working conditions and an improved quality of life for working families across the United States;

Whereas the NFFE represents more than 100,000 Federal employees; and

Whereas the NFFE continues to ensure that the voices of Federal civil servants are properly represented: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate congratulates and honors the National Federation of Federal Employees on the celebration of the 100th anniversary of its founding.

SENATE RESOLUTION 256—RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND CELEBRATING THE HERITAGE AND CULTURE OF LATINOS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE IMMENSE CONTRIBUTIONS OF LATINOS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. RUBIO)) submitted the

following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 256

Whereas from September 15, 2017, through October 15, 2017, the United States celebrates Hispanic Heritage Month;

Whereas the Bureau of the Census estimates the Hispanic population living in the continental United States at over 57,000,000, plus an additional 3,500,000 living in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, making Hispanic Americans almost 18 percent of the total population of the United States and the largest racial or ethnic minority group in the United States;

Whereas, in 2016, there were close to 1,000,000 or more Latino residents in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and in each of the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington;

Whereas, between July 1, 2015, and July 1, 2016, Latinos grew the United States population by approximately 1,131,766 individuals, accounting for ½ of the total population growth during that period;

Whereas, by 2060, the Latino population in the United States is projected to grow to 119,000,000, and the Latino population will comprise more than 28.6 percent of the total United States population;

Whereas the Latino population in the United States is currently the third largest worldwide, exceeding the size of the population in every Latin American and Caribbean country except Mexico and Brazil;

Whereas, in 2016, there were more than 18,345,742 Latino children under the age of 18 in the United States, which represents approximately ⅓ of the total Latino population in the United States;

Whereas more than 1 in 4 public school students in the United States are Latino, and the ratio of Latino students is expected to rise to nearly 30 percent by 2027;

Whereas 19 percent of all college students between the ages of 18 and 24 are Latino, making Latinos the largest racial or ethnic minority group on college campuses in the United States, including 2-year community colleges and 4-year colleges and universities;

Whereas a record 12,700,000 Latinos voted in the 2016 Presidential election, representing a record 9.2 percent of the electorate in the United States;

Whereas the number of eligible Latino voters is expected to rise to 40,000,000 by 2030, accounting for 40 percent of the growth in the eligible electorate in the United States by 2032;

Whereas each year approximately 800,000 Latino citizens turn 18 years old and become eligible to vote, a number that could grow to 1,000,000 by 2030, adding a potential 18 million new Latino voters by 2032;

Whereas, in 2016, the annual purchasing power of Hispanic Americans was an estimated $1,400,000,000,000, which is an amount greater than the economy of all except 17 countries in the world;

Whereas there are more than 4,700,000 Hispanic-owned firms in the United States, supporting millions of employees nationwide and contributing more than $600,000,000,000 in revenue to the economy of the United States;

Whereas Hispanic-owned businesses represent the fastest-growing segment of small businesses in the United States, with Latino-owned businesses growing at more than 15 times the national rate;

Whereas, as of August 2017, more than 27,000,000 Latino workers represented 17 percent of the total civilian labor force of the United States, and the rate of Latino labor force participation is expected to grow to 28 percent by 2024, accounting for approximately 48 percent of the total labor force increase in the United States by that year;

Whereas, with 65.8 percent labor force participation, Latinos have the highest labor force participation rate of any racial or ethnic group, as compared to 62.9 percent labor force participation overall;

Whereas, as of 2016, there were 312,228 Latino elementary and middle school teachers, 92,344 Latino chief executives of businesses, 63,448 Latino lawyers, 62,599 Latino physicians and surgeons, and 11,109 Latino psychologists, who contribute to the United States through their professions;

Whereas Hispanic Americans serve in all branches of the Armed Forces and have fought bravely in every war in the history of the United States;

Whereas, as of July 31, 2016, more than 164,000 Hispanic active duty service members served with distinction in the Armed Forces;

Whereas, as of August 31, 2016, more than 284,000 Latinos have served in post-September 11, 2001, overseas contingency operations, including more than 8,500 Latinos serving as of September 2017 in operations in Iraq and Afghanistan;

Whereas, as of September 2015, at least 675 United States military fatalities in Iraq and Afghanistan were Hispanic;

Whereas an estimated 200,000 Hispanics were mobilized for World War I, and approximately 500,000 Hispanics served in World War II;

Whereas more than 80,000 Hispanics served in the Vietnam War, representing 5.5 percent of individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice for the United States in the conflict, even though Hispanics comprised only 4.5 percent of the population of the United States during the Vietnam War;

Whereas approximately 148,000 Hispanic soldiers served in the Korean War, including the 65th Infantry Regiment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, known as the ''Borinqueneers'', the only active duty, segregated Latino military unit in United States history;

Whereas, as of 2015, there were more than 1,200,200 living Hispanic veterans of the Armed Forces, including 136,000 Latinas;

Whereas 61 Hispanic Americans have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force bestowed on an individual serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas Hispanic Americans are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of the Government of the United States, including 1 seat on the Supreme Court of the United States, 4 seats in the Senate, 34 seats in the House of Representatives, and 1 seat in the Cabinet; and

Whereas Hispanic Americans harbor a deep commitment to family and community, an enduring work ethic, and a perseverance to succeed and contribute to society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15, 2017, through October 15, 2017;

(2) esteems the integral role of Latinos and the manifold heritage of Latinos in the economy, culture, and identity of the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe Hispanic Heritage Month with appropriate programs and activities that celebrate the contributions of Latinos to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 257—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 16, 2017, AS ''ISAAC M. WISE TEMPLE DAY''

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 257

Whereas 2017 marks the 175th anniversary of the incorporation of the congregation of the Isaac M. Wise Temple in Cincinnati, Ohio;

Whereas 2017 marks the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the current site for the Isaac M. Wise Temple, also known as the ''Plum Street Temple'';

Whereas Rabbi Isaac M. Wise led that congregation for nearly a half century, establishing the congregation as the cradle of American Reform Judaism and helping to make Cincinnati a center of Jewish life in the United States;

Whereas Rabbi Isaac M. Wise founded the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (now known as the ''Union for Reform Judaism'') in 1873 and the Central Conference of Reform Rabbis in 1889 to help lead the United States Jewish Reform movement;

Whereas Rabbi Isaac M. Wise founded the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati in 1875, now the oldest rabbinical school in continuous existence in the United States; and

Whereas the Isaac M. Wise Plum Street Temple is listed on the National Register of Historic Places for the significant role that the Temple played in the history of Reform Judaism and for the unique Moorish architectural style of the Temple: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 16, 2017, as ''Isaac M. Wise Temple Day''; and

(2) recognizes the importance of the Isaac M. Wise Temple in—

(A) United States Jewish history;

(B) establishing Cincinnati, Ohio, as a great center of Jewish life; and

(C) contributing to religious life in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 258—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 10, 2017, AS ''NATIONAL DIRECT SUPPORT PROFESSIONALS RECOGNITION WEEK''

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 258

Whereas direct support professionals, including direct care workers, personal assistants, personal attendants, in-home support workers, and paraprofessionals, are key to providing publicly funded, long-term support and services for millions of individuals with disabilities;

Whereas direct support professionals provide essential support to help keep individuals with disabilities connected to their families, friends, and communities so as to avoid more costly institutional care;

Whereas direct support professionals support individuals with disabilities by helping those individuals make person-centered choices that lead to meaningful, productive lives;

Whereas direct support professionals must build close, respectful, and trusted relationships with individuals with disabilities;

Whereas direct support professionals provide a broad range of individualized support to individuals with disabilities, including—

(1) assisting with the preparation of meals;

(2) helping with medication;

(3) assisting with bathing, dressing, and other aspects of daily living;

(4) assisting with access to their environment;

(5) providing transportation to school, work, religious, and recreational activities; and

(6) helping with general daily affairs, such as assisting with financial matters, medical appointments, and personal interests;

Whereas the participation of direct support professionals in medical care planning is critical to the successful transition of individuals from medical events to post-acute care and long-term support and services;

Whereas there is a documented critical and increasing shortage of direct support professionals throughout the United States;

Whereas direct support professionals are a critical element in supporting individuals who are receiving health care services for severe chronic health conditions and individuals with functional limitations;

Whereas many direct support professionals are the primary financial providers for their families;

Whereas direct support professionals are hardworking, taxpaying citizens who provide an important service to people with disabilities in the United States, yet many continue to earn low wages, receive inadequate benefits, and have limited opportunities for advancement, resulting in high turnover and vacancy rates that adversely affect the quality of support, safety, and health of individuals with disabilities;

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in Olmstead v. L.C. by Zimring, 527 U.S. 581 (June 22, 1999)—

(1) recognized the importance of the deinstitutionalization of, and community-based services for, individuals with disabilities; and

(2) held that, under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S. 12101 et seq.), a State must provide community-based services to persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities if—

(A) the community-based services are appropriate;

(B) the affected person does not oppose receiving the community-based services; and

(C) the community-based services can be reasonably accommodated after the community has taken into account the resources available to the State and the needs of other individuals with disabilities in the State; and

Whereas, in 2017, the majority of direct support professionals are employed in home- and community-based settings and that trend will increase over the next decade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning September 10, 2017, as ''National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week'';

(2) recognizes the dedication and vital role of direct support professionals in enhancing the lives of individuals with disabilities of all ages;

(3) appreciates the contribution of direct support professionals in supporting individuals with disabilities and their families in the United States;

(4) commends direct support professionals for being integral to the provision of long-term support and services for individuals with disabilities;

(5) encourages the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor to collect data specific to direct support professionals; and

(6) finds that the successful implementation of the public policies affecting individuals with disabilities in the United States depends on the dedication of direct support professionals.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues Senators COLLINS, BROWN, BLUMENTHAL, MARKEY, PORTMAN, KING, WARREN, MENENDEZ, and KLOBUCHAR to recognize the week beginning September 10th, 2017—this week—as National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week. The Senate has passed a similar resolution for the past nine years. Direct Support Professionals are an invaluable part of our Nation's health care system, caring for the most vulnerable Americans, including the chronically ill, seniors, and those living with a disability. With the help of Direct Support Professionals, these individuals can perform daily activities that many people take for granted, such as eating, bathing, dressing, and leaving the house. The work of Direct Support Professionals ensures that these individuals can be active participants in their communities.

In our Country, we are incredibly fortunate to have millions of service-oriented Americans who are willing to rise to the task of becoming a Direct Support Professional. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the employment of DSPs is projected to grow by an average of 26 percent from 2014 to 2024, compared to a 7 percent average growth rate for all occupations during that period. Unfortunately, direct support professionals are often forced to leave the jobs they love due to low wages and excessive, difficult, work hours. Many Direct Support Professionals rely on public benefits, and some must work multiple jobs in order to provide for themselves and their families. Now, more than ever, it is imperative that we work to ensure that these hard-working individuals have the income and emotional support they need and deserve.

I urge my colleagues to join me in expressing appreciation for the critically important work of our Country's Direct Support Professionals, in thanking them for their commitment and dedication, and in supporting the resolution designating the week beginning September 10, 2017, as National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week.

SENATE RESOLUTION 259—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 11 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 15, 2017, AS ''NATIONAL FAMILY SERVICE LEARNING WEEK''

Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 259

Whereas family service learning is a method under which children and families learn and solve problems together in a multi-generational approach with active participation in thoughtfully organized service that—

(1) is conducted in, and meets the needs of, their communities;

(2) is focused on children and families solving community issues together;

(3) requires the application of college and career readiness skills by children and relevant workforce training skills by adults; and

(4) is coordinated between the community and an elementary school, a secondary school, an institution of higher education, or a family community service program;

Whereas family service learning—

(1) is multi-generational learning that involves parents, children, caregivers, and extended family members in shared learning experiences in physical and digital environments;

(2) is integrated into and enhances the academic achievement of children or the educational components of a family service program in which families may be enrolled; and

(3) promotes skills (such as investigation, planning, and preparation), action, reflection, the demonstration of results, and sustainability;

Whereas family service learning has been shown to have positive 2-generational effects and encourages families to invest in their communities to improve economic and societal well-being;

Whereas, through family service learning, children and families have the opportunity to solve community issues and learn together, thereby enabling the development of life and career skills, such as flexibility and adaptability, initiative and self-direction, social and cross-cultural skills, productivity and accountability, and leadership and responsibility;

Whereas family service learning activities provide opportunities for families to improve essential skills, such as organization, research, planning, reading and writing, technological literacy, teamwork, and sharing;

Whereas families participating together in service are afforded quality time learning about their communities;

Whereas adults engaged in family service learning serve as positive role models for their children;

Whereas family service learning projects enable families to build substantive connections with their communities, develop a stronger sense of self-worth, experience a reduction in social isolation, and improve parenting skills;

Whereas family service learning has added benefits for English language learners by helping individuals and families to—

(1) feel more connected with their communities; and

(2) practice language skills;

Whereas family service learning is particularly important for at-risk families because family service learning—

(1) provides opportunities for leadership and civic engagement; and

(2) helps build the capacity to advocate for the needs of children and families; and

Whereas the value that parents place on civic engagement and relationships within the community has been shown to transfer to children who, in turn, replicate important values, such as responsibility, empathy, and caring for others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the week of September 11 through September 15, 2017, as

''National Family Service Learning Week'' to raise public awareness about the importance of family service learning, family literacy, community service, and 2-generational learning experiences;

(2) encourages people across the United States to support family service learning and community development programs;

(3) recognizes the importance that family service learning plays in cultivating family literacy, civic engagement, and community investment; and

(4) calls upon public, private, and nonprofit entities to support family service learning opportunities to aid in the advancement of families.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1057. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1058. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1059. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1060. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1061. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1062. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1063. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1064. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1065. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1066. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1067. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1068. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1069. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1070. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1071. Mr. STRANGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1072. Mr. BURR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1073. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1074. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1075. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1076. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1077. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1078. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1079. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1080. Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1081. Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1082. Mr. STRANGE (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1083. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1084. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1085. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1086. Mr. STRANGE (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1087. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1088. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1089. Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. NELSON, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1090. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2810, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1091. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. WICKER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 129, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1057. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning in section 854, strike paragraph (3) and all that follows through the end of section 855 and insert the following:

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

''(2) When applying the preference for the acquisition of commercial items and nondevelopmental items under this section, priority shall be provided to small businesses for the acquisition of commercial items or nondevelopmental items.''.

SEC. 855. INAPPLICABLE LAWS AND REGULATIONS.

(a) REVIEW OF DETERMINATIONS NOT TO EXEMPT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS FOR COMMERCIAL ITEMS AND COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE OFF-THE-SHELF ITEMS FROM CERTAIN LAWS AND REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) review each determination of the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council pursuant to section 1906(b)(2), section 1906(c)(3), or section 1907(a)(2) of title 41, United States Code, not to exempt contracts and subcontracts described in subsection (a) of section 2375 of title 10, United States Code, from laws such contracts and subcontracts would

otherwise be exempt from under section 1906(d) of title 41, United States Code; and

(2) revise the Department of Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation to provide an exemption from each law subject to such determination unless the Secretary determines there is a specific reason not to provide the exemption.

(b) ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACT CLAUSE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO COMMERCIAL ITEM CONTRACTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall revise the Department of Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation to eliminate all regulations promulgated after the date of the enactment of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355) that require a specific contract clause for a contract using commercial item acquisition procedures under part 12 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, except for regulations required by law, unless the Secretary determines on a case-by-case basis that there is a specific reason not to eliminate the requirement.

(c) ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACT CLAUSE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE OFF-THE-SHELF ITEM SUBCONTRACTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall revise the Department of Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation to eliminate all requirements for a prime contractor to include a specific contract clause in a subcontract for commercially available off-the-shelf items unless the inclusion of such clause is required by law or is necessary for the contractor to meet the requirements of the prime contract, unless the Secretary determines on a case-by-case basis that there is a specific reason not to eliminate the requirement.

SA 1058. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 342, line 16, insert after ''may'' the following: '', with the concurrence of the Secretary of State,''.

On page 342, beginning on line 18, strike '', with the concurrence of the Secretary of State,''.

On page 343, line 20, strike ''in consultation with'' and insert ''with the concurrence of''.

On page 343, line 25, strike ''in consultation with'' and insert ''with the concurrence of''.

On page 344, beginning on line 1, strike ''the congressional defense committees'' and insert ''the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives''.

On page 603, line 21, insert after ''may'' the following: '', with the concurrence of the Secretary of State,''.

On page 606, line 21, strike ''the congressional defense committees'' and insert ''the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives''.

On page 632, line 14, strike ''the congressional defense committees'' and insert ''the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives''.

On page 643, beginning on line 6, strike ''the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives'' and insert ''the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives''.

On page 698, line 20, insert after ''malicious cyber activities'' the following: '', including those''.

On page 729, beginning on line 7, strike ''the congressional defense committees'' and insert ''the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives''.

SA 1059. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. _____. CARRIAGE OF CERTAIN PROGRAMMING.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''local commercial television station'' has the meaning given the term in section 614(h) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 534(h));

(2) the term ''multichannel video programming distributor'' has the meaning given the term in section 602 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 522);

(3) the term ''qualified noncommercial educational television station'' has the meaning given the term in section 615(l) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 535(l));

(4) the term ''retransmission consent'' means the authority granted to a multichannel video programming distributor under section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) to retransmit the signal of a television broadcast station; and

(5) the term ''television broadcast station'' has the meaning given the term in section 76.66(a) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) CARRIAGE OF CERTAIN CONTENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a multichannel video programming distributor may not be directly or indirectly required, including as a condition of obtaining retransmission consent, to—

(1) carry the primary or secondary video stream of any local commercial television station, qualified noncommercial educational television station, or television broadcast station if that stream broadcasts video programming that is owned, controlled, or financed (in whole or in part) by the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) lease, or otherwise make available, channel capacity to any person for the provision of video programming that is owned, controlled, or financed (in whole or in part) by the Government of the Russian Federation.

SA 1060. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle H—Bilateral Access to Foreign Data

SEC. 1091. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Bilateral Access to Foreign Data Act of 2017''.

SEC. 1092. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Timely access to electronic data held by communications-service providers is an essential component of government efforts to protect public safety and combat serious crime, including terrorism.

(2) Such efforts by the United States Government are being impeded by the inability to access the content of data stored outside the United States that is in the custody, control, or possession of communications-service providers that are subject to jurisdiction of the United States.

(3) Foreign governments also increasingly seek access to electronic data held by communications service providers in the United States for the purpose of combating serious crime.

(4) Communications-service providers face potential conflicting legal obligations when a foreign government orders production of electronic data that United States law may prohibit providers from disclosing.

(5) Foreign law may create similarly conflicting legal obligations when the United States Government orders production of electronic data that foreign law prohibits communications-service providers from disclosing.

(6) International agreements provide a mechanism for resolving these potential conflicting legal obligations where the United States and the relevant foreign government share a common commitment to the rule of law and the protection of privacy and civil liberties.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this subtitle are to—

(1) provide authority to implement international agreements to resolve potential conflicting legal obligations arising from cross-border requests for the production of electronic data where the foreign government targets non-United States persons outside the United States in connection with the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of serious crime; and

(2) ensure reciprocal benefits to the United States of such international agreements.

SEC. 1093. AMENDMENTS TO CURRENT COMMUNICATIONS LAWS.

Title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in chapter 119—

(A) in section 2511(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) It shall not be unlawful under this chapter for a provider of electronic communication service to the public or remote computing service to intercept or disclose the contents of a wire or electronic communication in response to an order from a foreign government that is subject to an executive agreement that the Attorney General has determined and certified to Congress satisfies section 2523.''; and

(B) in section 2520(d), by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) a good faith determination that section 2511(3), 2511(2)(i), or 2511(2)(j) of this title permitted the conduct complained of;'';

(2) in chapter 121—

(A) in section 2702—

(i) in subsection (b)—

(I) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) to a foreign government pursuant to an order from a foreign government that is subject to an executive agreement that the Attorney General has determined and certified to Congress satisfies section 2523.''; and

(ii) in subsection (c)—

(I) in paragraph (5), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(II) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) a foreign government pursuant to an order from a foreign government that is subject to an executive agreement that the Attorney General has determined and certified to Congress satisfies section 2523.''; and

(B) in section 2707(e), by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) a good faith determination that section 2511(3), section 2702(b)(9), or section 2702(c)(7) of this title permitted the conduct complained of;''; and

(3) in chapter 206—

(A) in section 3121(a), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or an order from a foreign government that is subject to an executive agreement that the Attorney General has determined and certified to Congress satisfies section 2523''; and

(B) in section 3124—

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

''(d) NO CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST A PROVIDER DISCLOSING INFORMATION UNDER THIS CHAPTER.—No cause of action shall lie in any court against any provider of a wire or electronic communication service, its officers, employees, agents, or other specified persons for providing information, facilities, or assistance in accordance with a court order under this chapter, request pursuant to section 3125 of this title, or an order from a foreign government that is subject to an executive agreement that the Attorney General has determined and certified to Congress satisfies section 2523.''; and

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

''(e) DEFENSE.—A good faith reliance on a court order under this chapter, a request pursuant to section 3125 of this title, a legislative authorization, a statutory authorization, or a good faith determination that the conduct complained of was permitted by an order from a foreign government that is subject to executive agreement that the Attorney General has determined and certified to Congress satisfies section 2523, is a complete defense against any civil or criminal action brought under this chapter or any other law.''.

SEC. 1094. EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS ON ACCESS TO DATA BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 119 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 2523. Executive agreements on access to data by foreign governments

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'lawfully admitted for permanent residence' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)); and

''(2) the term 'United States person' means a citizen or national of the United States, an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, an unincorporated association a substantial number of members of which are citizens of the United States or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or a corporation that is incorporated in the United States.

''(b) EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of this chapter, chapter 121, and chapter 206, an executive agreement governing access by a foreign government to data subject to this chapter, chapter 121, or chapter 206 shall be considered to satisfy the requirements of this section if the Attorney General, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, determines, and submits a written certification of such determination to Congress, that—

''(1) the domestic law of the foreign government, including the implementation of that law, affords robust substantive and procedural protections for privacy and civil liberties in light of the data collection and activities of the foreign government that will be subject to the agreement, if—

''(A) such a determination under this section takes into account, as appropriate, credible information and expert input; and

''(B) the factors to be considered in making such a determination include whether the foreign government—

''(i) has adequate substantive and procedural laws on cybercrime and electronic evidence, as demonstrated by being a party to the Convention on Cybercrime, done at Budapest November 23, 2001, and entered into force January 7, 2004, or through domestic laws that are consistent with definitions and the requirements set forth in chapters I and II of that Convention;

''(ii) demonstrates respect for the rule of law and principles of non-discrimination;

''(iii) adheres to applicable international human rights obligations and commitments or demonstrates respect for international universal human rights, including—

''(I) protection from arbitrary and unlawful interference with privacy;

''(II) fair trial rights;

''(III) freedom of expression, association, and peaceful assembly;

''(IV) prohibitions on arbitrary arrest and detention; and

''(V) prohibitions against torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment;

''(iv) has clear legal mandates and procedures governing those entities of the foreign government that are authorized to seek data under the executive agreement, including procedures through which those authorities collect, retain, use, and share data, and effective oversight of these activities;

''(v) has sufficient mechanisms to provide accountability and appropriate transparency regarding the collection and use of electronic data by the foreign government; and

''(vi) demonstrates a commitment to promote and protect the global free flow of information and the open, distributed, and interconnected nature of the Internet;

''(2) the foreign government has adopted appropriate procedures to minimize the acquisition, retention, and dissemination of information concerning United States persons subject to the agreement; and

''(3) the agreement requires that, with respect to any order that is subject to the agreement—

''(A) the foreign government may not intentionally target a United States person or a person located in the United States, and shall adopt targeting procedures designed to meet this requirement;

''(B) the foreign government may not target a non-United States person located outside the United States if the purpose is to obtain information concerning a United States person or a person located in the United States;

''(C) the foreign government may not issue an order at the request of or to obtain information to provide to the United States Government or a third-party government, nor shall the foreign government be required to share any information produced with the United States Government or a third-party government;

''(D) an order issued by the foreign government—

''(i) shall be for the purpose of obtaining information relating to the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of serious crime, including terrorism;

''(ii) shall identify a specific person, account, address, or personal device, or any other specific identifier as the object of the order;

''(iii) shall be in compliance with the domestic law of that country, and any obligation for a provider of an electronic communications service or a remote computing service to produce data shall derive solely from that law;

''(iv) shall be based on requirements for a reasonable justification based on articulable and credible facts, particularity, legality, and severity regarding the conduct under investigation;

''(v) shall be subject to review or oversight by a court, judge, magistrate, or other independent authority; and

''(vi) in the case of an order for the interception of wire or electronic communications, and any extensions thereof, shall require that the interception order—

''(I) be for a fixed, limited duration; and

''(II) may not last longer than is reasonably necessary to accomplish the approved purposes of the order; and

''(III) be issued only if the same information could not reasonably be obtained by another less intrusive method;

''(E) an order issued by the foreign government may not be used to infringe freedom of speech;

''(F) the foreign government shall promptly review material collected pursuant to the agreement and store any unreviewed communications on a secure system accessible only to those persons trained in applicable procedures;

''(G) the foreign government shall, using procedures that, to the maximum extent possible, meet the definition of minimization procedures in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801), segregate, seal, or delete, and not disseminate material found not to be information that is, or is necessary to understand or assess the importance of information that is, relevant to the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of serious crime, including terrorism, or necessary to protect against a threat of death or seriously bodily harm to any person;

''(H) the foreign government may not disseminate the content of a communication of a United States person to United States authorities unless the communication may be disseminated pursuant to subparagraph (G) and relates to significant harm, or the threat thereof, to the United States or United States persons, including crimes involving national security such as terrorism, significant violent crime, child exploitation,

transnational organized crime, or significant financial fraud;

''(I) the foreign government shall afford reciprocal rights of data access, to include, where applicable, removing restrictions on communications service providers and thereby allow them to respond when the United States Government orders production of electronic data that foreign law would otherwise prohibit communications-service providers from disclosing;

''(J) the foreign government shall agree to periodic review of compliance by the foreign government with the terms of the agreement to be conducted by the United States Government; and

''(K) the United States Government shall reserve the right to render the agreement inapplicable as to any order for which the United States Government concludes the agreement may not properly be invoked.

''(c) LIMITATION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A determination or certification made by the Attorney General under subsection (b) shall not be subject to judicial or administrative review.

''(d) EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTIFICATION.—

''(1) NOTICE.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which the Attorney General certifies an executive agreement under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall provide notice of the determination under subsection (b) and a copy of the executive agreement to Congress, including—

''(A) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

''(2) ENTRY INTO FORCE.—An executive agreement that is determined and certified by the Attorney General to satisfy the requirements of this section shall enter into force not earlier than the date that is 90 days after the date on which notice is provided under paragraph (1), unless Congress enacts a joint resolution of disapproval in accordance with paragraph (4).

''(3) CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—During the 60-day period beginning on the date on which notice is provided under paragraph (1), each congressional committee described in paragraph (1) may—

''(i) hold one or more hearings on the executive agreement; and

''(ii) submit to their respective House of Congress a report recommending whether the executive agreement should be approved or disapproved.

''(B) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—Upon request by the Chairman or Ranking Member of a congressional committee described in paragraph (1), the head of an agency shall promptly furnish a summary of factors considered in determining that the foreign government satisfies the requirements of section 2523.

''(4) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—

''(A) JOINT RESOLUTION DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution—

''(i) introduced during the 90-day period described in paragraph (2);

''(ii) which does not have a preamble;

''(iii) the title of which is as follows: 'Joint resolution disapproving the executive agreement signed by the United States and ____.', the blank space being appropriately filled in; and

''(iv) the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the executive agreement governing access by _____ to certain electronic data as submitted by the Attorney General on _____', the blank spaces being appropriately filled in.

''(B) JOINT RESOLUTION ENACTED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if not later than 90 days after the date on which notice is provided to Congress under paragraph (1), there is enacted into law a joint resolution disapproving of an executive agreement under this section, the executive agreement shall not enter into force.

''(C) INTRODUCTION.—During the 90-day period described in subparagraph (B), a joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

''(i) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

''(ii) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

''(5) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 60 days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

''(6) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

''(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be—

''(i) referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

''(ii) referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

''(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee to which a joint resolution of disapproval was referred has not reported the joint resolution within 60 days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

''(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after either the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the case may be, reports a joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

''(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

''(E) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

''(7) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) TREATMENT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION IN HOUSE.—In the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply to a joint resolution of disapproval received from the Senate (unless the House has already passed a joint resolution relating to the same proposed action):

''(i) The joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committees.

''(ii) If a committee to which a joint resolution has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 7 days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

''(iii) Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution has been referred reports the joint resolution to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

''(iv) The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

''(B) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—

''(i) If, before the passage by the Senate of a joint resolution of disapproval, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply:

''(I) That joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee.

''(II) With respect to that joint resolution—

''(aa) the procedure in the Senate shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the House of Representatives; but

''(bb) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

''(ii) If, following passage of a joint resolution of disapproval in the Senate, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate Senate calendar.

''(iii) If a joint resolution of disapproval is received from the House, and no companion joint resolution has been introduced in the Senate, the Senate procedures under this subsection shall apply to the House joint resolution.

''(C) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to a joint resolution of disapproval that is a revenue measure.

''(8) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

''(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

''(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''(e) RENEWAL OF DETERMINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall renew a determination under subsection (b) every 5 years.

''(2) REPORT.—Upon renewing a determination under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall file a report with the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives describing—

''(A) the reasons for the renewal;

''(B) any substantive changes to the agreement or to the relevant laws or procedures of the foreign government since the original determination or, in the case of a second or subsequent renewal, since the last renewal; and

''(C) how the agreement has been implemented and what problems or controversies, if any, have arisen as a result of the agreement or its implementation.

''(3) NON-RENEWAL.—If a determination is not renewed under paragraph (1), the agreement shall no longer be considered to satisfy the requirements of this section.

''(f) PUBLICATION.—Any determination or certification under subsection (b) regarding an executive agreement under this section, including any termination or renewal of such an agreement, shall be published in the Federal Register as soon as is reasonably practicable.

''(g) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—A United States authority that receives the content of a communication described in subsection (b)(3)(H) from a foreign government in accordance with an executive agreement under this section shall use procedures that, to the maximum extent possible, meet the definition of minimization procedures in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801) to appropriately protect nonpublicly available information concerning United States persons.''.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 119 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2522 the following:

''2523. Executive agreements on access to data by foreign governments.''.

SEC. 1095. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle, or the amendments made by this subtitle, shall be construed to preclude any foreign authority from obtaining assistance in a criminal investigation or prosecution pursuant to section 3512 of title 18, United States Code, section 1782 of title 28, United States Code, or as otherwise provided by law.

SA 1061. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1088. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING UNCONDITIONAL REPEAL OF THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) since the enactment of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25; 125 Stat. 240) budget requests have been guided by artificial constraints rather than the realities of the global strategic environment;

(2) sequestration and artificial budget caps on national defense, including nondefense agencies that contribute to the national security, are harmful to the security of the Nation;

(3) for the Armed Forces specifically, such constraints on the budget, along with a sustained high operational tempo, have led to a significant degradation in military readiness in the near term, and the threat that the United States will fall behind its adversaries in the long-term;

(4) in order to address the degraded state of the Armed Forces and to stop the erosion of the military advantage of the United States, Congress believes that the budget should be based on requirements, rather than arbitrary budget caps;

(5) this Act authorizes $659,000,000,000 in discretionary spending for defense within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, which is spending well above the current caps under the Budget Control Act of 2011; and

(6) Congress agrees with the statement that included in the report to accompany S. 1519 (115th Congress), dated July 10, 2017 (Report 115–125) that ''The committee has ongoing concerns about the negative impact of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–25) on the Department of Defense and other agencies that contribute to our national security and supports its unconditional repeal.''.

SA 1062. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle ____—Sanctions With Respect to North Korea

SEC. ____01. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017''.

SEC. ____02. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since 2006, the United Nations Security Council has approved 5 resolutions imposing sanctions against North Korea under chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, which—

(A) prohibit the use, development, and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by the Government of North Korea;

(B) prohibit the transfer of arms and related materiel to or by the Government of North Korea;

(C) prohibit the transfer of luxury goods to North Korea;

(D) restrict access by the Government of North Korea to the financial system and require due diligence on the part of financial institutions to prevent the financing of proliferation involving the Government of North Korea;

(E) restrict North Korean shipping, including the reflagging of ships owned or controlled by the Government of North Korea;

(F) limit the sale by the Government of North Korea of precious metals, iron, coal, vanadium, and rare earth minerals; and

(G) prohibit the transfer to North Korea of rocket, aviation, or jet fuel.

(2) The Government of North Korea has threatened to carry out nuclear attacks against the United States and South Korea and has sent clandestine agents to kidnap or murder the citizens of foreign countries and murder dissidents in exile.

(3) The Federal Bureau of Investigation has determined that the Government of North Korea was responsible for cyberattacks against the United States and South Korea.

(4) In February 2016, the Director of National Intelligence reported that the Government of North Korea is ''committed to developing a long-range, nuclear-armed missile that is capable of posing a direct threat to the United States'' and some arms control experts have estimated that the Government of North Korea may acquire this capability by 2020.

(5) The Government of North Korea tested its 5th and largest nuclear device on September 9, 2016.

(6) The Government of North Korea has increased the pace of its missile testing, including the test of a submarine-launched ballistic missile, potentially furthering the development of capability to attack the United States with a nuclear weapon.

(7) Financial transactions and investments that provide financial resources to the Government of North Korea, and that fail to incorporate adequate safeguards against the misuse of those financial resources, pose an undue risk of contributing to—

(A) weapons of mass destruction programs of that Government; and

(B) prohibited imports or exports of arms and related materiel, services, or technology by that Government.

(8) The strict enforcement of sanctions is essential to the efforts by the international community to achieve the peaceful, complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of weapons of mass destruction programs of the Government of North Korea.

SEC. ____03. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPLICABLE EXECUTIVE ORDER; APPLICABLE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION; GOVERNMENT OF NORTH KOREA; NORTH KOREA.—The terms ''applicable Executive order'', ''applicable United Nations Security Council resolution'', ''Government of North Korea'', and ''North Korea'' have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9202).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(3) KNOWINGLY.—The term ''knowingly'', with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(4) NORTH KOREAN COVERED PROPERTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''North Korean covered property'' includes any goods, services, or technology—

(i) that are in North Korea;

(ii) that are made with significant amounts of North Korean labor, materials, goods, or technology;

(iii) in which the Government of North Korea or a North Korean financial institution has a significant interest or exercises significant control; or

(iv) in which a designated person has a significant interest or exercises significant control.

(B) DESIGNATED PERSON.—In this paragraph, the term designated person means a person who is designated under—

(i) an applicable executive order;

(ii) an applicable United Nations Security Council resolution; or

(iii) section 104 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9204).

(5) NORTH KOREAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''North Korean financial institution'' includes—

(A) any North Korean financial institution, as defined in section 3 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9202);

(B) any financial agency, as defined in section 5312 of title 31, United States Code, that is owned or controlled by the Government of North Korea;

(C) any money transmitting business, as defined in section 5330(d) of title 31, United States Code, that is owned or controlled by the Government of North Korea; and

(D) any financial institution that is a joint venture between any person and the Government of North Korea.

(6) SECRETARY.—Unless otherwise specified, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(7) UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''United States financial institution'' means a financial institution that—

(A) is a United States person, regardless of where the person operates; or

(B) operates or does business in the United States, including by conducting wire transfers through correspondent banks in the United States.

(8) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) a citizen or resident of the United States or a national of the United States (as defined in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)); and

(B) an entity that is organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign subsidiary of such an entity.

PART I—FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS AND SANCTIONS RELATING TO TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING NORTH KOREA

SEC. ___11. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS PROVIDING SUPPORT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NORTH KOREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201A of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9221a) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 201A. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS PROVIDING SUPPORT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NORTH KOREA.

''(a) REPORT ON NONCOMPLIANT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and publish in the Federal Register a report that contains a list of any financial institutions that the President has identified as having engaged in, during the one-year period preceding the submission of the report, the following conduct:

''(A) Dealing in North Korean covered property.

''(B) Providing correspondent or interbank services to one or more North Korean financial institutions.

''(C) Failing to apply enhanced due diligence to prevent North Korean financial institutions from gaining access to correspondent or interbank services in the United States or provided by United States persons.

''(D) Knowingly operating or participating with or on behalf of an offshore United States dollar clearing system that conducts transactions involving the Government of North Korea or North Korean covered property.

''(E) Conducting or facilitating one or more significant transactions in North Korean covered property involving covered goods (as that term is defined in section 1027.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation) or the currency of a country other than the country in which the person is operating at the time of the transaction.

''(2) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

''(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS AND PENALTIES.—If the President determines that a financial institution identified under subsection (a) has knowingly engaged in conduct described in that subsection, the President shall apply one or more of the following with respect to that financial institution:

''(1) Prohibit the opening, and prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States of any correspondent account or payable-through account by the financial institution if the financial institution is a foreign financial institution.

''(2) In accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of the financial institution if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

''(3) In the case of a United States financial institution—

''(A) if the financial institution has taken reasonable steps to prevent a recurrence of conduct described in that subsection and is cooperating fully with the efforts of the President to enforce the provisions of this Act and the Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017—

''(i) unless the financial institution is described in clause (ii), the imposition of a civil penalty not to exceed $100,000 for each reportable act described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of subsection (a)(1) that is knowingly conducted; or

''(ii) if the financial institution has not previously been reported for similar conduct under subsection (a), the issuance of a cautionary letter to that financial institution; or

''(B) if the financial institution is not a financial institution described in subparagraph (A), for each reportable act described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of subsection (a)(1) that is knowingly conducted, the imposition of a civil penalty not to exceed the greater of—

''(i) $250,000; or

''(ii) an amount that is twice the amount of the transaction that is the basis of the reportable act with respect to which the penalty is imposed.

''(c) SUSPENSION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES.—The President may suspend the submission of the reports described in subsection (a) and the application of sanctions and penalties described in subsection (b) for a one-year period if—

''(1) such reporting and application of sanctions and penalties could compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation or prosecution; or

''(2) a criminal prosecution is pending, or a criminal or civil fine or penalty has been imposed or conditionally deferred, for the conduct reported pursuant to subsection (a).

''(d) SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS AND PENALTIES.—

''(1) SUSPENSION.—The President may suspend the application of any sanctions or penalties under subsection (b) for a period of not more than one year if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of North Korea is taking steps toward—

''(A) the verification of its compliance with applicable United Nations Security Council Resolutions; and

''(B) fully accounting for and repatriating United States citizens and permanent residents (including deceased United States citizens and permanent residents)—

''(i) abducted or unlawfully held captive by the Government of North Korea; or

''(ii) detained in violation of the Agreement Concerning a Military Armistice in Korea, signed at Panmunjom July 27, 1953 (commonly referred to as the 'Korean War Armistice Agreement').

''(2) RENEWAL OF SUSPENSION.—The President may renew a suspension described in paragraph (1) for additional periods of not more than 180 days if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of North Korea continues to take steps as described in paragraph (1).

''(3) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—Subject to subsection (f), the President may terminate the application of any sanctions or penalties under subsection (b) if the President certifies that the Government of North Korea has made significant progress towards—

''(A) completely, verifiably, and irreversibly dismantling all of its nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological weapons programs, including all programs for the development of systems designed in whole or in part for the delivery of such weapons; and

''(B) fully accounting for and repatriating United States citizens and permanent residents (including deceased United States citizens and permanent residents)—

''(i) abducted or unlawfully held captive by the Government of North Korea; or

''(ii) detained in violation of the Agreement Concerning a Military Armistice in Korea, signed at Panmunjom July 27, 1953 (commonly referred to as the 'Korean War Armistice Agreement').

''(e) WAIVER.—Subject to subsection (f), the President may waive the application of sanctions or penalties under subsection (b) with respect to a financial institution if the President determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

''(f) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF PROPOSED ACTIONS TO WAIVE OR TERMINATE SANCTIONS.—

''(1) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF PROPOSED ACTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, before taking any action described in subparagraph (B), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report that describes the proposed action and the reasons for that action.

''(B) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—An action described in this subparagraph is—

''(i) an action to suspend, renew a suspension, or terminate under subsection (d) the application of sanctions or penalties under subsection (b); or

''(ii) with respect to sanctions or penalties under subsection (b) imposed by the President with respect to a person, an action to waive under subsection (e) the application of those sanctions or penalties with respect to that person.

''(C) DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF ACTION.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) with respect to an action described in subparagraph (B) shall include a description of whether the action—

''(i) is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to North Korea; or

''(ii) is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to North Korea.

''(D) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL MATTER.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to North Korea shall include a description of—

''(I) the significant alteration to United States foreign policy with regard to North Korea;

''(II) the anticipated effect of the action on the national security interests of the United States; and

''(III) the policy objectives for which the sanctions affected by the action were initially imposed.

''(ii) REQUESTS FROM BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEES.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate or the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives may request the submission to the Committee of the matter described in subclauses (II) and (III) of clause (i) with respect to a report submitted under subparagraph (A) that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to North Korea.

''(2) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under paragraph (1)(A)—

''(i) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to North Korea, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report; and

''(ii) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to North Korea, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under subparagraph (A) of a report required to be submitted under paragraph (1)(A) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

''(C) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period for congressional review provided for under subparagraph (A) of a report submitted under paragraph (1)(A) proposing an action described in paragraph (1)(B), including any additional period for such review as applicable under the exception provided in subparagraph (B), the President may not take that action unless a joint resolution of approval with respect to that action is enacted in accordance with paragraph (3).

''(D) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1)(A) proposing an action described in paragraph (1)(B) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with paragraph (3), the President may not take that action for a period of 12 calendar days after the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

''(E) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1)(A) proposing an action described in paragraph (1)(B) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with paragraph (3), and the President vetoes the joint resolution, the President may not take that action for a period of 10 calendar days after the date of the President's veto.

''(F) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1)(A) proposing an action described in paragraph (1)(B) is enacted in accordance with paragraph (3), the President may not take that action.

''(3) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OR APPROVAL.—

''(A) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OR APPROVAL DEFINED.—In this paragraph:

''(i) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—The term 'joint resolution of approval' means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

''(I) the title of which is as follows: 'A joint resolution approving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to North Korea.'; and

''(II) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: 'Congress approves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to North Korea proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 201A(f)(1)(A) of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 on _____ relating to _____.', with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

''(ii) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—The term 'joint resolution of disapproval' means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

''(I) the title of which is as follows: 'A joint resolution disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to North Korea.'; and

''(II) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: 'Congress disapproves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to North Korea proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 201A(f)(1)(A) of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 on _____ relating to _____.', with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

''(B) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under paragraph (2)(A), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2)(B), a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

''(i) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

''(ii) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

''(C) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(i) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

''(ii) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred reports the joint resolution to the House or has been discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

''(iii) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

''(D) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

''(i) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be—

''(I) referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs if the joint resolution relates to a report submitted under paragraph (1)(A) with respect to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to North Korea; and

''(II) referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations if the joint resolution relates to a report submitted under paragraph (1)(A) with respect to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to North Korea.

''(ii) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval was referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

''(iii) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs or the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the case may be, reports a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

''(iv) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules

of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

''(v) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

''(E) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(i) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval of that House, that House receives an identical joint resolution from the other House, the following procedures shall apply:

''(I) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(II) With respect to the joint resolution of the House receiving the joint resolution from the other House—

''(aa) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(bb) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''(ii) TREATMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval of the other House shall be entitled to expedited procedures in that House under this subsection.

''(iii) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—If, following passage of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval in the Senate, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate Senate calendar.

''(iv) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this subparagraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval that is a revenue measure.

''(F) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This paragraph is enacted by Congress—

''(i) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

''(ii) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''(g) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of efforts by the President to prevent conduct described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of subsection (a)(1).

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit any person from, or authorize or require the imposition of sanctions with respect to any person for, conducting or facilitating any transaction for the sale or donation of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices.

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees and leadership' means—

''(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

''(2) CORRESPONDENT ACCOUNT; PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNT.—The terms 'correspondent account' and 'payable-through account' have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.

''(3) KNOWINGLY.—The term 'knowingly', with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

''(4) NORTH KOREAN COVERED PROPERTY; NORTH KOREAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION; UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The terms 'North Korean covered property', 'North Korean financial institution', and 'United States financial institution' have the meanings given those terms in section ___03 of the Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 is amended by striking the item relating to section 201A and inserting the following:

''201A. Sanctions with respect to financial institutions providing support to the Government of North Korea.''.

SEC. ___12. EXPANSION OF LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSACTIONS IN NORTH KOREAN COVERED PROPERTY.

(a) LICENSE REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prescribe regulations prohibiting any transaction involving the manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, import, or export of North Korean covered property by a United States person or conducted in the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary may grant licenses and permits for the following purposes:

(i) For any purpose covered by an exemption or waiver under section 208 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9228), including humanitarian, diplomatic, consular, law enforcement, and other purposes.

(ii) To import food products into North Korea if such food products are not defined as luxury goods.

(iii) To meet an urgent and compelling humanitarian need.

(iv) For activities to promote human rights in North Korea, the development of private agriculture and markets in North Korea, and the free flow of information to, from, and within North Korea.

(v) To import agricultural products, medicine, or medical devices into North Korea if such products, medicine, or devices are classified as designated ''EAR 99'' under subchapter C of chapter VII of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulations (commonly known as the ''Export Administration Regulations''), and not controlled under—

(I) the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 et seq.), as continued in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(II) the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.);

(III) part B of title VIII of the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.); or

(IV) the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 (22 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.).

(B) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may not grant a license or permit under subparagraph (A) for an activity described in section 104(a) of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9214(a)).

(b) PENALTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A person shall be fined not more than $5,000,000, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both, if the person knowingly—

(A) engages in a transaction described in subsection (a)(1), except pursuant to a license or permit granted under this section or regulations prescribed pursuant to this section; or

(B) evades a requirement to obtain a license or permit under this section or a regulations prescribed pursuant to this section.

(2) FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY.—Any property, real or personal, that is involved in a transaction that is a violation of subsection (a)(1), is involved in an attempt to conduct such a transaction, or constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to such a transaction, is subject to forfeiture to the United States.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report listing any licenses or permits granted under subsection (a).

(2) FORM.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 30 days after the submission of a report under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State shall each publish the unclassified part of the report on a publicly available Internet website of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of State, as the case may be.

(d) TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—The President may terminate the prohibition on transactions described in subsection (a) and the imposition of penalties under subsection (b) if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in section 402 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9252).

(e) MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF SPECIFIED UNLAWFUL ACTIVITY FOR MONEY LAUNDERING PURPOSES.—Section 1956(c)(7)(D) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or section 104(a) of the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2016'' and inserting ''section 104(a) of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016''; and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', or section ___02(b) of the Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017 (relating to transactions in certain North Korean property)''.

SEC. ___13. AUTHORIZATION OF IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE PROVISION OF SPECIALIZED FINANCIAL MESSAGING SERVICES TO NORTH KOREAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND SANCTIONED PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 318 of the Korean Interdiction and Modernization of Sanctions Act (Public Law 115–44) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 318. AUTHORIZATION OF IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE PROVISION OF SPECIALIZED FINANCIAL MESSAGING SERVICES TO NORTH KOREAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND SANCTIONED PERSONS.

''(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(1) providers of specialized financial messaging services have been used as a critical link between the Government of North Korea and the international financial system;

''(2) the Financial Action Task Force has repeatedly called for jurisdictions to apply countermeasures to protect the financial system from the risks of money laundering and proliferation financing emanating from North Korea;

''(3) credible published reports have implicated the Government of North Korea in stealing approximately $81,000,000 from the Bangladesh Bank and attempting to steal another $951,000,000 from other banks using a financial messaging service; and

''(4) directly providing specialized financial messaging services to, or enabling or facilitating direct or indirect access to such messaging services for, any financial institution designated by the United Nations Security Council is inconsistent with applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions.

''(b) BRIEFING ON MEASURES TO DENY SPECIALIZED FINANCIAL MESSAGING SERVICES TO DESIGNATED NORTH KOREAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for 5 years, the President shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing that includes the following information:

''(A) A list of each person or foreign government the President has identified that knowingly and directly provides specialized financial messaging services to, or knowingly enables or facilitates direct or indirect access to such messaging services for—

''(i) a North Korean financial institution;

''(ii) a person, including a financial institution, that is designated pursuant to—

''(I) an applicable Executive order;

''(II) an applicable United Nations Security Council resolution; or

''(III) section 104 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9214); or

''(iii) a person subject to sanctions under the Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017.

''(B) A detailed assessment of the status of efforts by the Secretary of the Treasury to work with the relevant authorities in the home jurisdictions of such specialized financial messaging providers to end such provision or access.

''(2) FORM.—The briefing required under paragraph (1) may be classified.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may impose sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to a person if, on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017, the person knowingly and directly provides specialized financial messaging services to, or knowingly enables or facilitates direct or indirect access to such messaging services for—

''(1) a North Korean financial institution;

''(2) a person, including a financial institution, that is designated pursuant to—

''(A) an applicable Executive order;

''(B) an applicable United Nations Security Council resolution; or

''(C) section 104 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9214); or

''(3) a person subject to sanctions under the Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017.

''(d) ENABLING OR FACILITATING ACCESS TO SPECIALIZED FINANCIAL MESSAGING SERVICES.—For purposes of this section, enabling or facilitating direct or indirect access to specialized financial messaging services to a person described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c) includes doing so by serving as an intermediary financial institution with access to such messaging services.

''(e) SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—

''(1) SUSPENSION.—The President may suspend the application of any sanctions under subsection (c) for a period of not more than one year if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of North Korea is taking steps toward—

''(A) the verification of its compliance with applicable United Nations Security Council Resolutions; and

''(B) fully accounting for and repatriating United States citizens and permanent residents (including deceased United States citizens and permanent residents)—

''(i) abducted or unlawfully held captive by the Government of North Korea; or

''(ii) detained in violation of the Agreement Concerning a Military Armistice in Korea, signed at Panmunjom July 27, 1953 (commonly referred to as the 'Korean War Armistice Agreement').

''(2) RENEWAL OF SUSPENSION.—The President may renew a suspension described in paragraph (1) for additional periods of not more than 180 days if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of North Korea continues to take steps as described in paragraph (1).

''(3) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may terminate the application of any sanctions under subsection (c) if the President certifies that the Government of North Korea has made significant progress towards—

''(A) completely, verifiably, and irreversibly dismantling all of its nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological weapons programs, including all programs for the development of systems designed in whole or in part for the delivery of such weapons; and

''(B) fully accounting for and repatriating United States citizens and permanent residents (including deceased United States citizens and permanent residents)—

''(i) abducted or unlawfully held captive by the Government of North Korea; or

''(ii) detained in violation of the Agreement Concerning a Military Armistice in Korea, signed at Panmunjom July 27, 1953 (commonly referred to as the 'Korean War Armistice Agreement').

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) APPLICABLE EXECUTIVE ORDER; APPLICABLE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION; GOVERNMENT OF NORTH KOREA; NORTH KOREA.—The terms 'applicable Executive order', 'applicable United Nations Security Council resolution', 'Government of North Korea', and 'North Korea' have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9202).

''(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

''(3) KNOWINGLY.—The term 'knowingly', with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

''(4) NORTH KOREAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'North Korean financial institution' has the meaning given that term in section ___03 of the Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115–44) is amended by striking the item relating to section 318 and inserting the following:

''318. Authorization of imposition of sanctions with respect to the provision of specialized financial messaging services to North Korean financial institutions and sanctioned persons.''.

SEC. ___14. AUTHORIZATION OF IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO GOVERNMENTS THAT FAIL TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL SANCTIONS AGAINST NORTH KOREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 317 of the Korean Interdiction and Modernization of Sanctions Act (Public Law 115–44) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

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

''(c) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may impose one or more of the sanctions described in paragraph (2) with respect to a government that the President has determined has knowingly failed to carry out the activities set forth in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a) until such time as the President determines that the government has taken substantial steps to carry out such activities.

''(2) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this paragraph to be imposed with respect to the government of a country are the following:

''(A) Prohibit or curtail the export of any goods or technology to that country pursuant to the authorities provided in section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

''(B) Withhold assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) to that government.

''(C) Instruct the United States executive director at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c))) to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose the provision of loans, benefits, or other use of the funds of the institution to that government.

''(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to limit the use of other sanctions authorities available to the President in response to governments of countries failing to carry out the activities set forth in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public

Law 115–44) is amended by striking the item relating to section 317 and inserting the following:

''317. Authorization of imposition of sanctions with respect to governments that fail to comply with United Nations Security Council sanctions against North Korea.''.

SEC. ___15. GRANTS TO CONDUCT RESEARCH ON FINANCIAL NETWORKS AND FINANCIAL METHODS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NORTH KOREA.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Director of National Intelligence, may award grants to, and enter into cooperative agreements with, States, units of local government, nongovernmental organizations, and relevant international organizations to further the purposes of this title and provide data to address the issues identified in section ___02.

(2) RESEARCH INITIATIVES.—Grants awarded and cooperative agreements entered into under paragraph (1) shall include grants and agreements for the purpose of conducting research initiatives on the following:

(A) The methods used by the Government of North Korea to deal in, transact in, or conceal the ownership, control, or origin of North Korean covered property.

(B) The relationship between proliferation by the Government of North Korea and the financial industry or financial institutions.

(C) The export by any person to the United States of North Korean covered property.

(D) The involvement of any person in human trafficking involving citizens or nationals of North Korea.

(E) Information relating to transactions described in section ___12(a).

(F) Information relating to activities by governments as described in section 317(a) of the Korean Interdiction and Modernization of Sanctions Act (Public Law 115–44).

(G) Information relating to the identification, blocking, and release of property or proceeds described in section ___17(a).

(H) The effectiveness of law enforcement and diplomatic initiatives of Federal, State, and foreign governments to comply with the provisions of applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions.

(I) The effectiveness of compliance programs within the financial industry to ensure compliance with applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions.

(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—The President shall ensure that any information collected pursuant to subsection (a) is shared among the agencies involved in investigations described in section 102(b) of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9212(b)).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2021 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. ___16. REPORT ON USE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF NORTH KOREA OF BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP RULES TO ACCESS THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 11, 2018, the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the Department of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and publish in the Federal Register a report setting forth the findings of the Director regarding how the Government of North Korea is using laws regarding beneficial ownership of property to access the international financial system.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The Director shall include in the report required under subsection (a) proposals for such legislative and administrative action as the Director considers appropriate.

SEC. ___17. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IDENTIFICATION AND BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF NORTH KOREAN OFFICIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should collaborate with the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative of the World Bank Group and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to prioritize the identification, blocking, and release for humanitarian purposes of—

(1) any property owned or controlled by a North Korean official; or

(2) any significant proceeds of kleptocracy by the Government of North Korea or a North Korean official.

(b) NORTH KOREAN OFFICIAL DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''North Korean official'' includes—

(1) the individuals described in section 304(a)(2)(B) of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9243(a)(2)(B)); and

(2) such additional officials as the President may determine to be officials of the Government of North Korea.

SEC. ___18. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE KAESONG INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On October 14, 2006, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1718, paragraph 8(d) of which requires member states of the United Nations to ensure that persons under their jurisdiction prevent any funds, financial assets, and economic resources from being used by persons or entities engaged in or proving support for the nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons programs of North Korea or the ballistic missile programs of North Korea.

(2) On April 11, 2011, the President signed Executive Order 13570 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to prohibiting certain transactions with respect to North Korea), which prohibits the importation into the United States, directly or indirectly, of any goods, services, or technology from North Korea, except as provided in statute or in licenses, regulations, orders, or directives that may be issued pursuant to that Executive Order.

(3) In April 2013, the Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence said, in reference to the Kaesong Industrial Complex, ''Precisely what North Koreans do with earnings from Kaesong, I think, is something that we are concerned about.''.

(4) In February 2016, on announcing the suspension of operations at the Kaesong Industrial Complex, the Unification Ministry of the Republic of Korea stated that the Government of North Korea may have used the proceeds from the Kaesong Industrial Complex to finance its nuclear weapons program.

(5) On November 30, 2016, the United States Security Council approved Resolution 2321, paragraph 32 of which requires member states of the United Nations to prohibit public and private financial support for trade with North Korea from within their territories or by persons subject to their jurisdiction, including the granting of export credits, guarantees, or insurance to persons involved in such trade, except as approved in advance by a committee appointed by the Security Council on a case-by-case basis.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States stands in solidarity with its ally in the Republic of Korea, and has expressed that solidarity with the sacrifice of 36,914 people of the United States and with the continued presence of 29,500 members of the Armed Forces of the United States in the Republic of Korea;

(2) the nuclear weapons program of North Korea poses a grave and imminent threat to the freedom and security of both the United States and the Republic of Korea;

(3) the Kaesong Industrial Complex yielded few, if any, apparent benefits with regard to the reform, liberalization, or disarmament of North Korea;

(4) the unconditional provision of revenue from the Kaesong Industrial Complex to the Government of North Korea undermines the financial pressure necessary to strict and effective enforcement of United Nations Security Council sanctions;

(5) the strict and effective enforcement of United Nations Security Council sanctions is the last plausible option to achieve the complete, verifiable, irreversible, and peaceful nuclear disarmament of North Korea; and

(6) the Kaesong Industrial Complex should not be reopened until the Government of North Korea has completely, verifiably, and irreversibly dismantled all of its nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological weapons programs, including all programs for the development of systems designed in whole or in part for the delivery of such weapons.

PART II—DIVESTMENT FROM NORTH KOREA

SEC. ___21. AUTHORITY OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO DIVEST FROM COMPANIES THAT INVEST IN NORTH KOREA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should support the decision of any State or local government, for moral, prudential, or reputational reasons, to divest from, or prohibit the investment of assets of the State or local government in, a person that engages in investment activities involving North Korean covered property if North Korea is subject to economic sanctions imposed by the United States or the United Nations Security Council.

(b) AUTHORITY TO DIVEST.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State or local government may adopt and enforce measures that meet the requirements of subsection (c) to divest the assets of the State or local government from, or prohibit investment of the assets of the State or local government in, any person that the State or local government determines, using credible information available to the public, engages in investment activities involving North Korean covered property of a value of more than $10,000.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—Any measure taken by a State or local government under subsection (b) shall meet the following requirements:

(1) NOTICE.—The State or local government shall provide written notice to each person with respect to which a measure under this section is to be applied.

(2) TIMING.—The measure applied under this section shall apply to a person not earlier than the date that is 90 days after the date on which written notice under paragraph (1) is provided to the person.

(3) OPPORTUNITY TO DEMONSTRATE COMPLIANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The State or local government shall provide to each person with respect to which a measure is to be applied under this section an opportunity to demonstrate to the State or local government that the person does not engage in investment activities in North Korean covered property.

(B) NONAPPLICATION.—If a person with respect to which a measure is to be applied under this section demonstrates to the State or local government under subparagraph (A)

that the person does not engage in investment activities in North Korean covered property, the measure shall not apply to that person.

(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON AVOIDING ERRONEOUS TARGETING.—It is the sense of Congress that a State or local government should not adopt a measure under subsection (b) with respect to a person unless the State or local government has—

(A) made every effort to avoid erroneously targeting the person; and

(B) verified that the person engages in investment activities in North Korean covered property.

(d) NOTICE TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—Not later than 30 days after a State or local government applies a measure under this section, the State or local government shall notify the Attorney General of that measure.

(e) AUTHORIZATION FOR PRIOR APPLIED MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or any other provision of law, a State or local government may enforce a measure (without regard to the requirements of subsection (c), except as provided in paragraph (2)) applied by the State or local government before the date of the enactment of this Act that provides for the divestment of assets of the State or local government from, or prohibits the investment of the assets of the State or local government in, any person that the State or local government determines, using credible information available to the public, engages in investment activities in North Korean covered property that are identified in that measure.

(2) APPLICATION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—A measure described in paragraph (1) shall be subject to the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)(A) of subsection (c) on and after the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) NO PREEMPTION.—A measure applied by a State or local government authorized under subsection (b) or (e) is not preempted by any Federal law.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ASSET.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ''asset'' means public monies, and includes any pension, retirement, annuity, endowment fund, or similar instrument, that is controlled by a State or local government.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The term ''asset'' does not include employee benefit plans covered by title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(2) INVESTMENT.—The term ''investment'' includes—

(A) a commitment or contribution of funds or property;

(B) a loan or other extension of credit; and

(C) the entry into or renewal of a contract for goods or services.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (e), this section applies to measures applied by a State or local government before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (h), subsections (c) and (d) apply to measures applied by a State or local government on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. ___22. SAFE HARBOR FOR CHANGES OF INVESTMENT POLICIES BY ASSET MANAGERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13(c)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–13(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) engage in investment activities involving North Korean covered property, as defined in section ____03 of the Banking Restrictions Involving North Korea (BRINK) Act of 2017.''.

(b) SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION REGULATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue any revisions the Securities and Exchange Commission determines to be necessary to the regulations requiring disclosure by each registered investment company that divests itself of securities in accordance with section 13(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–13(c)), including in accordance with paragraph (1)(C) of that section, as added by subsection (a)(3).

SEC. ___23. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CERTAIN ERISA PLAN INVESTMENTS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a fiduciary of an employee benefit plan, as defined in section 3(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(3)), may divest plan assets from, or avoid investing plan assets in, any person the fiduciary determines engages in investment activities involving North Korean covered property, if—

(A) the fiduciary makes that determination using credible information that is available to the public; and

(B) the fiduciary prudently determines that the result of that divestment or avoidance of investment would not be expected to provide the employee benefit plan with—

(i) a lower rate of return than alternative investments with commensurate degrees of risk; or

(ii) a higher degree of risk than alternative investments with commensurate rates of return; and

(2) by divesting assets or avoiding the investment of assets as described in paragraph (1), the fiduciary is not breaching the responsibilities, obligations, or duties imposed upon the fiduciary by subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 404(a)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1104(a)(1)).

SEC. ___24. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle, an amendment made by this subtitle, or any other provision of law authorizing sanctions with respect to North Korea shall be construed to affect or displace—

(1) the authority of a State or local government to issue and enforce rules governing the safety, soundness, and solvency of a financial institution subject to its jurisdiction; or

(2) the regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance, pursuant to the Act of March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 34, chapter 20; 15 U.S.C. 1011 et seq.) (commonly known as the ''McCarran-Ferguson Act'').

PART III—GENERAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. ___31. RULEMAKING.

The President may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle and amendments made by this subtitle.

SEC. ___32. AUTHORITY TO CONSOLIDATE REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any and all reports required to be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees under this subtitle or an amendment made by this subtitle that are subject to a deadline for submission consisting of the same unit of time may be consolidated into a single report that is submitted pursuant to that deadline.

(b) CONTENTS.—Any reports consolidated under subsection (a) shall contain all information required under this subtitle or the amendment made by this subtitle and any other elements that may be required by existing law.

SEC. ___33. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle or an amendment made by this subtitle shall be construed to limit the authority or obligation of the President—

(1) to apply the sanctions described in—

(A) section 104 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9214) with regard to persons that meet the criteria for designation under such section; or

(B) the Korean Interdiction and Modernization of Sanctions Act (title III of Public Law 115–44); or

(2) to exercise any other law enforcement authorities available to the President.

SA 1063. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 886, beginning in the new section 2320a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1) of such section 886, strike subsection (c) of such section 2320a and all that follows through the end of subsection (d)(1) of such section 886 and insert the following:

''(c) APPLICABILITY TO EXISTING SOFTWARE.—The Secretary of Defense shall, where appropriate—

''(1) seek to negotiate open source licenses to existing custom-developed computer software with contractors that developed it; and

''(2) release related source code and technical data in a public repository location approved by the Department of Defense.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CUSTOM-DEVELOPED COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—The term 'custom-developed computer software'—

''(A) means human-readable source code, including segregable portions thereof, that is—

''(i) first produced in the performance of a Department of Defense contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or other transaction; or

''(ii) developed by a contractor or subcontractor exclusively with Federal funds (other than an item or process developed under a contract or subcontract to which regulations under section 9(j)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)(2)) apply); and

''(B) does not include Commercial Off-The-Shelf software, or packaged software developed exclusively at private expense, whether delivered as a Cloud Service, in binary form, or by any other means of software delivery.

''(2) TECHNICAL DATA.—The term 'technical data' has the meaning given the term in section 2302 of this title.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2320 the following new item:

''2320a. Use of open source software.''.

(b) PRIZE COMPETITION.—The Secretary of Defense shall create a prize for a research and develop program or other activity for identifying, capturing, and storing existing Department of Defense custom-developed computer software and related technical data. The Secretary of Defense shall create

an additional prize for improving, repurposing, or reusing software to better support the Department of Defense mission. The prize programs shall be conducted in accordance with section 2374a of title 10, United States Code.

(c) REVERSE ENGINEERING.—The Secretary of Defense shall task the Defense Advanced Research Program Agency with a project to identify methods to locate and reverse engineer Department of Defense custom-developed computer software and related technical data for which source code is unavailable.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CUSTOM-DEVELOPED COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—The term ''custom-developed computer software''—

(A) means human-readable source code, including segregable portions thereof, that is—

(i) first produced in the performance of a Department of Defense contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or other transaction; or

(ii) developed by a contractor or subcontractor exclusively with Federal funds (other than an item or process developed under a contract or subcontract to which regulations under section 9(j)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)(2)) apply); and

(B) does not include Commercial Off-The-Shelf software, or packaged software developed exclusively at private expense, whether delivered as a Cloud Service, in binary form, or by any other means of software delivery.

SA 1064. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. _____. TRAINING FOR NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL ON WILDFIRE RESPONSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force shall, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, provide for training of appropriate personnel of the National Guard on wildfire response, with preference given to States with the most acres of Federal forestlands administered by the U.S. Forest Service or the Department of the Interior.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense a total of $10,000,000, in addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated by sections 421 and 301, in order to carry out the training required by subsection (a) and provide related equipment.

SA 1065. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the funding table in section 4301, in the item relating to Environmental Restoration, Air Force, increase the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $20,000,000.

In the funding table in section 4301, in the item relating to Subtotal Environmental Restoration, Air Force, increase the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $20,000,000.

In the funding table in section 4301, in the item relating to Total Miscellaneous Appropriations, increase the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $20,000,000.

In the funding table in section 4301, in the item relating to Undistributed, Line number 999, reduce the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $20,000,000.

In the funding table in section 4301, in the item relating to Fuel Savings, increase the amount of the reduction indicated in the Senate Authorized column by $20,000,000.

In the funding table in section 4301, in the item relating to Subtotal Undistributed, reduce the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $20,000,000.

In the funding table in section 4301, in the item relating to Total Undistributed, reduce the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $20,000,000.

SA 1066. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR LIU XIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Liu Xia shall be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Liu Xia enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), Liu Xia shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully in the United States and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for the issuance of an immigrant visa or the application for adjustment of status is filed with appropriate fees not later than the later of—

(1) 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) 2 years after the date on which Liu Xia is released from incarceration or travel restriction imposed by the People's Republic of China.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon the granting of an immigrant visa or permanent residence to Liu Xia, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by 1, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Liu Xia under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Liu Xia under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

SA 1067. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. INCLUSION OF FEDERAL SUBSIDIES IN CALCULATION OF FULLY BURDENED COST OF DROP-IN FUELS.

Section 2922h(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', including any financial contributions from a Federal agency other than the Department of Defense, including the Commodity Credit Corporation under the Department of Agriculture, for the purpose of reducing the total price of the fuel,'' after ''commodity price of the fuel''.

SA 1068. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. LIMITATION ON OBSERVATION FLIGHTS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION OVER THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE OPEN SKIES TREATY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used to aid, support, or permit in any manner observation flights of the Russian Federation over the United States under the Open Skies Treaty until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress each of the following:

(1) That the Russian Federation has removed all restrictions regarding access to observation flights of the United States and other covered state parties over the entirety of Russia in a manner that permits full implementation of the observation rights provided to the United States and covered state parties under the Open Skies Treaty.

(2) That the Russian Federation provides the same Air Traffic Control prioritization to observation aircraft from the United States and covered state parties that it receives from other participants under the Open Skies Treaty.

(3) That no upgraded sensors will be employed in observation flights of the Russian Federation or Belarus over the United States under the Open Skies Treaty unless the Russian Federation has agreed to the employment of advanced sensors, consistent with the Open Skies Treaty, on United States observation aircraft, and the United States has

deployed such sensors, for observation flights over Russia under the Open Skies Treaty.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED STATE PARTY.—The term ''covered state party'' means a foreign country that—

(A) is a state party to the Open Skies Treaty; and

(B) is a United States ally.

(2) OBSERVATION AIRCRAFT, OBSERVATION FLIGHT, AND SENSOR.—The terms ''observation aircraft'', ''observation flight'', and ''sensor'' have the meanings given such terms in Article II of the Open Skies Treaty.

(3) OPEN SKIES TREATY.—The term ''Open Skies Treaty'' means the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

SA 1069. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT ON ILLICIT ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN IRANIAN PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 60 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes the following:

(1) A list of each person listed, or required to be listed, in Attachment 3 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action that has, on or after the date of the implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and before the date of the report, knowingly facilitated, participated or assisted in, engaged in, directed, or provided material support for activities described in subsection (b).

(2) A description of the activity described in subsection (b) engaged in by each person on the list required by paragraph (1).

(3) An assessment of the extent to which the activity described in subsection (b) engaged in by each person on the list required by paragraph (1) involves the provision or delivery of financial, material, or technological support to—

(A) the Government of Iran;

(B) Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps;

(C) any person with respect to which sanctions have been imposed under any provision of law imposing sanctions with respect to Iran; or

(D) any person that directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediaries, is controlled by, or is under common control with, an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

(b) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—An activity described in this subsection is any of the following:

(1) An act of international terrorism.

(2) The proliferation of nuclear or ballistic missile technology or spare parts.

(3) Illicit arms sales.

(4) Significant activities undermining cybersecurity.

(5) Violations of export controls.

(6) Financial crimes.

(7) Transnational organized crime, including drug and human trafficking.

(c) DETERMINATION AND PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—To the maximum extent practicable, the list required by subsection (a)(1) shall be made available to the public and posted on a publicly available Internet website of the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, or the Department of Commerce.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ACT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—The term ''act of international terrorism'' includes—

(A) an act of torture, extrajudicial killing, aircraft sabotage, or hostage taking, as those terms are defined in section 1605A(h) of title 28, United States Code; and

(B) providing material support or resources, as defined in section 2339A of title 18, United States Code, for an act described in subparagraph (A).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(3) KNOWINGLY.—The term ''knowingly'' has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(4) JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION.—The term ''Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action'' means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, agreed to at Vienna on July 14, 2015, by Iran and by the People's Republic of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States, with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

(5) PERSON.—The term ''person'' means an individual or entity.

(6) SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES UNDERMINING CYBERSECURITY.—The term ''significant activities undermining cybersecurity'' includes—

(A) significant efforts to—

(i) deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy an information and communications technology system or network; or

(ii) exfiltrate information from such a system or network without authorization;

(B) significant destructive malware attacks;

(C) significant denial or service activities; and

(D) such other significant activities undermining cybersecurity as may be specified in regulations prescribed to implement this section.

SA 1070. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. ___. COMBAT CAPABILITY AND MODERNIZATION OF B–2 FLEET.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall ensure that the B–2 fleet remains fully combat capable, that necessary modernization of the fleet continues, and that the aircraft remains in the primary mission aircraft inventory of the Air Force.

SA 1071. Mr. STRANGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1656. REVIEW OF PROPOSED GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SYSTEM CONTRACT.

(a) LIMITATION ON CHANGES TO CONTRACTING STRATEGY.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency may not change the contracting strategy for the systems integration, operations, and test of the ground-based midcourse defense system until the date on which—

(1) the report under subsection (b)(4) is submitted to the congressional defense committees; and

(2) a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date of such submittal.

(b) REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall conduct a review of the contract for the systems integration, operations, and test of the ground-based midcourse defense system.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The review required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Contract performance of current industry-led prime contract approach, including with respect to—

(i) system readiness performance and reliability growth;

(ii) development, integration, and fielding of new homeland defense capabilities; and

(iii) cost performance against baseline contract.

(B) With respect to alternate contracting approaches—

(i) an enumeration and detailing of any specific benefits for each such alternate approach;

(ii) an identification of specific costs to switching to each such alternate approach; and

(iii) detailing of the specific risks of each such alternate approach to homeland defense, including regarding schedule, costs, and the sustainment, maintenance, development, and fielding, of integrated capabilities.

(C) With respect to contracting approaches that transition to Federal Government-led systems engineering integration and test—

(i) an enumeration of the processes, procedures, and command media that have been established by the Missile Defense Agency and proven to be effective for the execution of programs that are of the scale of the ground-based midcourse defense system; and

(ii) the manner in which a new contract will control for growth in the personnel and support contracts of the Federal Government to support cost growth and minimize the risk of schedule delay.

(D) A baseline for historical and current staffing of the ground-based midcourse defense system program, specifically with respect to personnel of the Federal Government, personnel of federally funded research and development centers, personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and support contractors.

(E) Projections of the staffing categories specified in subparagraph (D) under a new contracting strategy and how such staffing categories will be limited to prevent significant cost growth and to minimize the risk of schedule delays.

(F) The views and recommendations of the Director for any changes the current ground-based midcourse defense system contract or a new contract, including the proposed contracting strategy of the Missile Defense Agency.

(G) Such other matters as the Director determines appropriate.

(3) TRANSMISSION.—The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall transmit to the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and the Missile Defense Executive Board the findings of the Director with respect to the review conducted under paragraph (1).

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Under Secretary and the Missile Defense Executive Board receive the findings of the Director under paragraph (3), the Under Secretary and Board shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing—

(A) the findings of the Director transmitted under paragraph (3), without change; and

(B) such views and recommendations of the Under Secretary and the Board may have with respect to such findings or the review conducted under paragraph (1).

SA 1072. Mr. BURR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1612. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR NOTIFICATION ON THE PROVISION OF DEFENSE SENSITIVE SUPPORT.

Section 1055 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is hereby repealed.

SA 1073. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1653 and insert the following:

SEC. 1653. GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTOR CAPABILITY, CAPACITY, AND RELIABILITY.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that it is the policy of the United States to maintain and improve, with the allies of the United States, an effective, robust layered missile defense system capable of defending the citizens of the United States residing in territories and States of the United States, allies of the United States, and deployed Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) INCREASE IN CAPACITY AND CONTINUED ADVANCEMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for National Missile Defense, increase the number of United States ground-based interceptors, unless otherwise directed by the Ballistic Missile Defense Review, by up to 28;

(2) develop a plan to further increase such number to the currently available missile field capacity of 104 and to plan for any future capacity at any site that may be identified by the Ballistic Missile Defense Review; and

(3) continue to rapidly advance missile defense technologies to improve the capability and reliability of the ground-based midcourse defense element of the ballistic missile defense system.

(c) DEPLOYMENT.—Not later than December 31, 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) execute any requisite construction to ensure that Missile Field 1 or Missile Field 2 at Fort Greely or alternative missile fields at Fort Greely which may be identified pursuant to subsection (b), are capable of supporting and sustaining additional ground-based interceptors;

(2) deploy up to 14 additional ground-based interceptors to Missile Field 1 or up to 20 additional ground-based interceptors to an alternative missile field at Fort Greely as soon as technically feasible; and

(3) identify a ground-based interceptor stockpile storage site for the remaining ground-based interceptors required by subsection (b).

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or recommended by the Ballistic Missile Defense Review (BMDR), the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 90 days after the completion of the Ballistic Missile Defense Review, a report on options to increase the capability, capacity, and reliability of the ground-based midcourse defense element of the ballistic missile defense system and the infrastructure requirements for increasing the number of ground-based interceptors in currently feasible locations across the United States.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An identification of potential sites in the United States, whether existing or new on the East Coast or in the Midwest, for the deployment of 104 ground-based interceptors.

(B) A cost-benefit analysis of each such site, including tactical, operational, and cost-to-construct considerations.

(C) A description of any completed and outstanding environmental assessments or impact statements for each such site.

(D) A description of the existing capacity of the missile fields at Fort Greely and the infrastructure requirements needed to increase the number of ground-based interceptors to 20 ground-based interceptors each.

(E) A description of the additional infrastructure and components needed to further outfit missile fields at Fort Greely before emplacing additional ground-based interceptors configured with the redesigned kill vehicle, including with respect to ground excavation, silos, utilities, and support equipment.

(F) A cost estimate of such infrastructure and components.

(G) An estimated schedule for completing such construction as may be required for such infrastructure and components.

(H) An identification of any environmental assessments or impact studies that would need to be conducted to expand such missile fields at Fort Greely beyond current capacity.

(I) An operational evaluation and cost analysis of the deployment of transportable ground-based interceptors, including an identification of potential sites, including in the eastern United States and at Vandenberg Air Force Base, and an examination of any environmental, legal, or tactical challenges associated with such deployments, including to any sites identified in subparagraph (A).

(J) A determination of the appropriate fleet mix of ground-based interceptor kill vehicles and boosters to maximize overall system effectiveness and increase its capacity and capability, including the costs and benefits of continued inclusion of capability enhancement II (CE-II) Block 1 interceptors after the fielding of the redesigned kill vehicle.

(K) A description of the planned improvements to homeland ballistic missile defense sensor and discrimination capabilities and an assessment of the expected operational benefits of such improvements to homeland ballistic missile defense.

(L) The benefit of supplementing ground-based midcourse defense elements with other, more distributed, elements, including both Aegis ships and Aegis Ashore installations with Standard Missile-3 Block IIA and other interceptors in Hawaii and at other locations for homeland missile defense.

(3) FORM.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SA 1074. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 812, beginning in the new section 2339a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1) of such section 812, strike ''$250,000''and all that follows through the end of subsection (b) of such section 812 and insert the following: ''$250,000. This section shall not apply for purposes of determining the value of the simplified acquisition threshold referred to in subsection 2533a(h) or subsection 2533b(f) of this title.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2339a. Simplified acquisition threshold.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 134 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking ''In division B'' and inserting ''Except as provided in section 2339a of title 10, in division B''.

(2) Section 2533a(h) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''referred to in section 2304(g) of this title'' and

inserting ''specified in section 134 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 2533b(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''referred to in section 2304(g) of this title'' and inserting ''specified in section 134 of title 41, United States Code''.

SA 1075. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

Subtitle K—Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces

SEC. 899G. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces Act of 2017''.

SEC. 899H. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COVERED CONTRACT.—The term ''covered contract'' means a Federal contract for the procurement of property or services, including construction, valued in excess of $500,000.

(2) COVERED SUBCONTRACT.—The term ''covered subcontract''—

(A) means a subcontract for property or services under a Federal contract that is valued in excess of $500,000; and

(B) does not include a subcontract for the procurement of commercially available off-the-shelf items.

(3) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 899I. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Over the last two decades, the role of private contractors in public projects has significantly increased. Having doubled the amount of taxpayer dollars spent on contract labor since the year 2000, the Federal Government, according to recent estimates, now purchases more than $500,000,000,000 worth of goods and services from private firms, which employ 26,000,000 workers.

(2) According to a majority staff report released in 2013 by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate (the ''HELP Committee''), in recent years, dozens of major Federal contractors have repeatedly violated basic Federal labor laws with impunity. From 2007 through 2012, 49 individual Federal contractors triggered 1,776 enforcement actions for violating basic health and safety standards, discriminating against workers, or failing to pay workers what they earned. Despite these repeated infractions, those 49 companies received $81,000,000,000 in Federal contracts in fiscal year 2012 alone.

(3) The HELP Committee staff report also showed that, from 2007 through 2012, companies holding large Federal contracts accounted for 48 percent of the penalties assessed by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's list of top 100 violators, and incurred more than $87,000,000 in penalties. In fact, 8 of these companies were found to be directly responsible for the deaths of 42 United States workers. Nevertheless, in fiscal year 2012, United States taxpayers provided these companies with $3,400,000,000 in Federal contracts.

(4) In addition to these health and safety violations, the HELP Committee report showed that Federal contractors have been repeatedly cited for violations of wage laws. Investigations of infractions by the Department of Labor often produce either a settlement or litigation, both of which can result in a back pay award for victimized workers. Between 2007 and 2012, Federal contractors accounted for 35 of the 100 largest back pay awards, and 32 Federal contractors were responsible for more than 40 percent of the total amount of unpaid back wages awarded during this period. Despite being compelled to pay more than $82,000,000 in back wages, these 32 violators received $73,100,000,000 of Federal contracts in fiscal year 2012.

(5) The fact that repeat offenders continue to receive lucrative Federal contracts indicates the profound lack of accountability in the present system of Federal contracting. Such a gap necessitates reforms to the relationship between contracting officers and the Department of Labor as well expanding the number of supervision and enforcement tools available to both, which will ensure contractor compliance with Federal labor laws.

(6) In 2014, President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13673 on Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces. In the executive order, the President determined that ''contractors that consistently adhere to labor laws are more likely to have workplace practices that enhance productivity and increase the likelihood of timely, predictable, and satisfactory delivery of goods and services to the Federal Government. Helping executive departments and agencies to identify and work with contractors with track records of compliance will reduce execution delays and avoid distractions and complications that arise from contracting with contractors with track records of noncompliance.''

(7) In furtherance of economy and efficiency in contracting, the Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces Executive Order took a three-pronged approach to these problems:

(A) Companies were required to disclose any violations of Federal labor law when applying for a contract. Those with poor track records of compliance were compelled to prove they had taken action to remedy these infractions.

(B) Federal contractors were required to give their employees pay stubs each pay period documenting hours, overtime, and wages to prevent wage theft.

(C) To protect workers from discrimination or harassment, the executive order prohibited the use of forced arbitration agreements in employment contracts by companies with large Federal contracts of $1,000,000 or more.

(8) Parties who contract with the Federal Government should ensure that they understand and comply with labor laws, which are designed to promote safe, healthy, fair, and effective workplaces.

(9) Contractors and subcontractors that consistently adhere to labor laws are more likely to have workplace practices that enhance productivity and increase the likelihood of timely, predictable, and satisfactory delivery of goods and services to the Federal Government.

SEC. 899J. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States that the Federal Government shall promote economy and efficiency in procurement by awarding contracts to contractors that promote safe, healthy, fair, and effective workplaces through compliance with labor laws, and by promoting opportunities for contractors to do the same when awarding subcontracts.

SEC. 899K. REQUIRED PRE-CONTRACT AWARD ACTIONS.

(a) DISCLOSURES.—The head of an executive agency shall ensure that the solicitation for a covered contract requires the offeror—

(1) to represent, to the best of the offeror's knowledge and belief, whether there has been any administrative merits determination, arbitral award or decision, or civil judgment, as defined in guidance issued by the Secretary of Labor, rendered against the offeror in the preceding 3 years for violations of—

(A) the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.);

(B) the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.);

(C) the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (29 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.);

(D) the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.);

(E) subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Davis-Bacon Act'');

(F) chapter 67 of title 41, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Service Contract Act'');

(G) Executive Order 11246 (42 U.S.C. 2000e note; relating to equal employment opportunity);

(H) section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 793);

(I) section 4212 of title 38, United States Code;

(J) the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.);

(K) title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.);

(L) the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.);

(M) the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 621 et seq.);

(N) Executive Order 13658 (79 Fed. Reg. 9851; relating to establishing a minimum wage for contractors); or

(O) equivalent State laws, as defined in guidance issued by the Secretary of Labor;

(2) to require each subcontractor for a covered subcontract—

(A) to represent, to the best of the subcontractor's knowledge and belief, whether there has been any administrative merits determination, arbitral award or decision, or civil judgment, as defined in guidance issued by the Department of Labor, rendered against the subcontract in the preceding three years for violations of any of the labor laws and executive orders listed under paragraph (1); and

(B) to update such information every 6 months for the duration of the subcontract; and

(3) to consider the information submitted by a subcontractor pursuant to paragraph (2) in determining whether the subcontractor is a responsible source with a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics—

(A) prior to awarding the subcontract; or

(B) in the case of a subcontract that is awarded or will become effective within 5 days of the prime contract being awarded, not later than 30 days after awarding the subcontract.

(b) PRE-AWARD CORRECTIVE MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A contracting officer, prior to awarding a covered contract, shall, as part of the responsibility determination, provide an offeror who makes a disclosure pursuant to subsection (a) an opportunity to report any steps taken to correct the violations of or improve compliance with the labor laws listed in paragraph (1) of such subsection, including any agreements entered into with an enforcement agency.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The executive agency's Labor Compliance Advisor designated pursuant to section 899M, in consultation with relevant enforcement agencies, shall advise the contracting officer whether agreements are in place or are otherwise needed to address appropriate remedial measures, compliance assistance, steps to resolve issues to avoid

further violations, or other related matters concerning the offeror.

(3) RESPONSIBILITY DETERMINATION.—The contracting officer, in consultation with the executive agency's Labor Compliance Advisor, shall consider information provided by the offeror under this subsection in determining whether the offeror is a responsible source with a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics. The determination shall be based on the guidelines established by the Department of Labor under subsection (b)(1) of section 899N and the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council under subsection (a) of such section.

(c) REFERRAL OF INFORMATION TO SUSPENSION AND DEBARMENT OFFICIALS.—As appropriate, contracting officers, in consultation with their executive agency's Labor Compliance Advisor, shall refer matters related to information provided pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) to the executive agency's suspension and debarment official in accordance with agency procedures.

SEC. 899L. POST-AWARD CONTRACT ACTIONS.

(a) INFORMATION UPDATES.—The contracting officer for a covered contract shall require that the contractor update the information provided under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 899K(a) every 6 months.

(b) CORRECTIVE ACTIONS.—

(1) PRIME CONTRACT.—The contracting officer, in consultation with the Labor Compliance Advisor designated pursuant to section 899M, shall determine whether any information provided under subsection (a) warrants corrective action. Such action may include—

(A) an agreement requiring appropriate remedial measures;

(B) compliance assistance;

(C) resolving issues to avoid further violations;

(D) the decision not to exercise an option on a contract or to terminate the contract;

(E) referral to the agency suspending and debarring official; or

(F) such other action as the contracting officer deems appropriate.

(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—The prime contractor for a covered contract, in consultation with the Labor Compliance Advisor, shall determine whether any information provided under section 899K(a)(2) warrants corrective action, including remedial measures, compliance assistance, and resolving issues to avoid further violations.

(3) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—The Department of Labor shall, as appropriate, inform executive agencies of its investigations of contractors and subcontractors on current Federal contracts for purposes of determining the appropriateness of actions described under paragraphs (1) and (2).

SEC. 899M. LABOR COMPLIANCE ADVISORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each executive agency shall designate a senior official to act as the agency's Labor Compliance Advisor.

(b) DUTIES.—The Labor Compliance Advisor shall—

(1) meet quarterly with the Deputy Secretary, Deputy Administrator, or equivalent executive agency official with regard to matters covered under this subtitle;

(2) work with the acquisition workforce, agency officials, and agency contractors to promote greater awareness and understanding of labor law requirements, including record keeping, reporting, and notice requirements, as well as best practices for obtaining compliance with these requirements;

(3) coordinate assistance for executive agency contractors seeking help in addressing and preventing labor violations;

(4) in consultation with the Department of Labor or other relevant enforcement agencies, and pursuant to section 899K(b) as necessary, provide assistance to contracting officers regarding appropriate actions to be taken in response to violations identified prior to or after contracts are awarded, and address complaints in a timely manner, by—

(A) providing assistance to contracting officers and other executive agency officials in reviewing the information provided pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of section 899K and section 899L(a), or other information indicating a violation of a labor law in order to assess the serious, repeated, willful, or pervasive nature of any violation and evaluate steps contractors have taken to correct violations or improve compliance with relevant requirements;

(B) helping agency officials determine the appropriate response to address violations of the requirements of the labor laws listed in section 899K(a)(1) or other information indicating such a labor violation (particularly serious, repeated, willful, or pervasive violations), including agreements requiring appropriate remedial measures, decisions not to award a contract or exercise an option on a contract, contract termination, or referral to the executive agency suspension and debarment official;

(C) providing assistance to appropriate executive agency officials in receiving and responding to, or making referrals of, complaints alleging violations by agency contractors and subcontractors of the requirements of the labor laws listed in section 899K(a)(1); and

(D) supporting contracting officers, suspension and debarment officials, and other agency officials in the coordination of actions taken pursuant to this subsection to ensure agency-wide consistency, to the extent practicable;

(5) as appropriate, send information to agency suspension and debarment officials in accordance with agency procedures;

(6) consult with the agency's Chief Acquisition Officer and Senior Procurement Executive, and the Department of Labor as necessary, in the development of regulations, policies, and guidance addressing labor law compliance by contractors and subcontractors;

(7) make recommendations to the agency to strengthen agency management of contractor compliance with labor laws;

(8) publicly report, on an annual basis, a summary of agency actions taken to promote greater labor compliance, including the agency's response pursuant to this order to serious, repeated, willful, or pervasive violations of the requirements of the labor laws listed in section 899K(a)(1); and

(9) participate in the interagency meetings regularly convened by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 899N(b)(2)(C).

SEC. 899N. MEASURES TO ENSURE GOVERNMENT-WIDE CONSISTENCY.

(a) FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—The Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of Labor, shall amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation—

(1) to identify, for the purpose of integrity and business ethics determinations made by contracting officers and contractors (with respect to subcontractors), considerations for determining the significance of serious, repeated, willful, or pervasive violations of the labor laws listed in section 899K(a)(1);

(2) to provide that, subject to the determination of the executive agency, in most cases a single violation of law may not necessarily give rise to a determination of lack of responsibility, depending on the nature of the violation;

(3) ensure appropriate consideration is given to any remedial measures or mitigating factors, including any agreements by contractors or other corrective action taken to address violations; and

(4) ensure that contracting officers and Labor Compliance Advisors send information, as appropriate, to suspension and debarment officials.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor (in this subsection referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall develop guidance, in consultation with the executive agencies responsible for enforcing the requirements of the labor laws listed in section 899K(a)(1), to assist such agencies in determining whether administrative merits determinations, arbitral awards or decisions, or civil judgments were issued for serious, repeated, willful, or pervasive violations of such requirements for purposes of implementation of any final rule issued by the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council pursuant to this subtitle.

(B) STANDARDS.—Such guidance shall—

(i) where available, incorporate existing statutory standards for assessing whether a violation is serious, repeated, willful, or pervasive; and

(ii) where no such statutory standards exist, develop standards that take into account—

(I) for determining whether a violation is ''serious'' in nature, the number of employees affected, the degree of risk posed or actual harm caused by the violation to health, safety, or well-being of a worker, the amount of damages incurred or fines or penalties assessed with regard to the violation, and other considerations as the Secretary determines appropriate;

(II) for determining whether a violation is ''repeated'' in nature, whether the entity has had one or more additional violations of the same or a substantially similar requirement during the previous 3 years;

(III) for determining whether a violation is ''willful'' in nature, whether the entity knew of, showed reckless disregard for, or acted with plain indifference to the matter of whether its conduct was prohibited by the requirements of the labor laws listed in section 899K(a)(1); and

(IV) for determining whether a violation is ''pervasive'' in nature, the number of violations of such a requirement, or the aggregate number of violations of such requirements, in relation to the size of the entity.

(2) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES AND LABOR COMPLIANCE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

(A) develop a process—

(i) for the Labor Compliance Advisors designated pursuant to section 899M to consult with the Secretary in carrying out their responsibilities under section 899M(b)(4);

(ii) by which contracting officers and Labor Compliance Advisors may give appropriate consideration to determinations and agreements made by the Secretary and the heads of other executive agencies; and

(iii) by which contractors may enter into agreements regarding steps a prospective contractor will take to ensure compliance with applicable labor laws (as described in section 899K of this Act) with the Secretary, or the head of another executive agency, prior to being considered for a contract;

(B) review data collection requirements and processes, and work with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Administrator for General Services, and other agency heads to improve such requirements and processes, as necessary, to reduce the burden on contractors and increase the amount of information available to executive agencies;

(C) regularly convene interagency meetings of Labor Compliance Advisors to share and promote best practices for improving labor law compliance; and

(D) designate an appropriate contact for executive agencies seeking to consult with the Secretary with respect to the requirements and activities under this subtitle.

(c) OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) work with the Administrator of General Services to include in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System the information provided by contractors pursuant to sections 899K(a)(1) and 899L(a) and data on the resolution of any issues related to such information; and

(2) designate an appropriate contact for agencies seeking to consult with the Office of Management and Budget on matters arising under this subtitle.

(d) GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of General Services, in consultation with other relevant executive agencies, shall establish a single Internet website for Federal contractors to use for all Federal contract reporting requirements under this subtitle, as well as any other Federal contract reporting requirements to the extent practicable.

(2) AGENCY COOPERATION.—The heads of executive agencies with covered contracts shall provide the Administrator of General Services with the data necessary to maintain the Internet website established under paragraph (1).

(e) MINIMIZING COMPLIANCE BURDEN.—In amending the Federal Acquisition Regulation pursuant to subsection (a) and developing guidance pursuant to subsection (b), the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council and the Secretary of Labor, respectively, shall minimize, to the extent practicable, the burden on contractors and subcontractors of complying with this subtitle, particularly small business concerns (as that term is defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)) and small non-profit organizations.

SEC. 899O. PAYCHECK TRANSPARENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each executive agency entering into a covered contract, or covered subcontract, shall ensure that provisions in solicitations for such contracts, or subcontracts, and clauses in such contracts, or subcontracts, shall provide that, for each pay period, contractors or subcontractors provide each individual described in subsection (b) with a document containing information with respect to such individual for the pay period concerning hours worked, overtime hours worked, pay, and any additions made to or deductions made from pay.

(b) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this subsection is any individual performing work under a contract or subcontract for which the executive agency is required to maintain wage records under—

(1) the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.);

(2) subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Davis-Bacon Act'');

(3) chapter 67 of title 41, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Service Contract Act''); or

(4) an applicable State law.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) EMPLOYEES EXEMPT FROM OVERTIME REQUIREMENTS.—The document provided under subsection (a) to individuals who are exempt under section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213) from the overtime compensation requirements under section 7 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 207) shall not be required to include a record of the hours worked if the contractor or subcontractor informs the individual of the status of such individual as exempt from such requirements.

(2) SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR STATE LAWS.—The requirements under this section shall be deemed to be satisfied if the contractor or subcontractor complies with State or local requirements that the Secretary of Labor has determined are substantially similar to the requirements under this section.

(d) INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS.—If the contractor or subcontractor is treating an individual performing work under a covered contract or subcontract as an independent contractor, and not as an employee, the contractor or subcontractor shall provide the individual a document informing the individual of their status as an independent contractor.

SEC. 899P. COMPLAINT AND DISPUTE TRANSPARENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) CONTRACTS.—The head of an executive agency may not enter into a contract for the procurement of property or services valued in excess of $1,000,000 unless the contractor agrees that any decision to arbitrate the claim of an employee or independent contractor performing work under the contract that arises under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or sexual harassment may only be made with the voluntary consent of the employee or independent contractor after the dispute arises.

(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—The Secretary shall require that a contractor covered under paragraph (1) incorporate the requirement under such subsection into each subcontract for the procurement of property or services valued in excess of $1,000,000 at any tier under the contract.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) CONTRACTS FOR COMMERCIAL ITEMS AND COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE OFF-THE-SHELF ITEMS.—The requirements under subsection (a) do not apply to contracts or subcontracts for the acquisition of commercial items or commercially available off-the-shelf items (as those terms are defined in sections 103(1) and 104, respectively, of title 41, United States Code).

(2) EMPLOYEES AND INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS NOT COVERED.—The requirements under subsection (a) do not apply with respect to an employee or independent contractor who—

(A) is covered by a collective bargaining agreement negotiated between the contractor or subcontractor and a labor organization representing the employee or independent contractor; or

(B) entered into a valid agreement to arbitrate claims covered under such subsection before the contractor or subcontractor bid on the contract covered under such subsection, except that such requirements do apply—

(i) if the contractor or subcontractor is permitted to change the terms of the arbitration agreement with the employee or independent contractor; or

(ii) in the event the arbitration agreement is renegotiated or replaced after the contractor or subcontractor bids on the contract.

SEC. 899Q. IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall, in addition to carrying out section 899N(a), amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation to carry out the other provisions of this subtitle, including sections 899O and 899P.

SEC. 899R. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Labor shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives a report on actions taken pursuant to this subtitle.

(b) INFORMATION INCLUDED.—The report required under this section shall include the following information:

(1) The number of instances that each executive agency, in accordance with sections 899K and 899L, required remedial measures, decided not to award a contract or exercise an option on a contract, terminated a contract, or referred an entity to an agency suspension and disbarment official.

(2) The number of unique contractors that were subject to actions described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 899S. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this subtitle or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remaining provisions of this subtitle and the application of such provisions to any person or circumstance shall not be affected by such holding.

SEC. 899T. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed as—

(1) impairing or otherwise affecting the authority granted by law to an executive agency or the head thereof;

(2) impairing or otherwise affecting the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals; or

(3) creating any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

SA 1076. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title I, add the following:

SEC. ___. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR AERONAUTICAL MOBILE APPLICATION ARCHITECTURE.

No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 or any other fiscal year may be used by the Department of Defense to conduct an acquisition for electronic flight bag aviation applications for Aeronautical Mobile Application Architecture if commercial off-the-shelf aviation applications are currently available.

SA 1077. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title XXVIII, insert the following:

SEC. ___. TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF PUBLIC LAND AUTHORITY, LIMESTONE HILLS TRAINING AREA, MONTANA.

Section 2931(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1031) is amended by striking ''18,644 acres in Broadwater County, Montana, generally depicted as 'Proposed Land Withdrawal' on the map entitled 'Limestone Hills Training Area Land Withdrawal', dated April 10, 2013'' and inserting ''18,964 acres in Broadwater County, Montana, generally depicted as 'Limestone Hills Training Area Land Withdrawal' on the map entitled 'Limestone Hills Training Area Land Withdrawal', dated May 11, 2017''.

SA 1078. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the funding table in section 4601, in the item relating to Washington Navy Yard AT/FP Land Acquisition, increase the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $60,000,000.

In the funding table in section 4601, in the item relating to Subtotal Mil Con, Navy, increase the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $60,000,000.

In the funding table in section 4601, in the item relating to Total Military Construction, increase the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $60,000,000.

In the funding table in section 4601, in the item relating to Total Military Construction, Family Housing, and BRAC, increase the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $60,000,000.

SA 1079. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. ___. CREDIT TOWARD COMPUTATION OF YEARS OF SERVICE FOR NONREGULAR SERVICE RETIRED PAY UPON COMPLETION OF REMOTELY DELIVERED MILITARY EDUCATION OR TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 12732(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

''(F) Such points (but not more than 10 points) as the Secretary concerned determines to be appropriate for successful completion of a course of instruction using electronically delivered methodologies to accomplish military education or training, unless the education or training is performed while in a status for which credit is provided under another subparagraph of this paragraph.''; and

(2) by striking ''and (E)'' in the last sentence and inserting ''(E), and (F)''.

(b) MAXIMUM NUMBER OF POINTS PER SERVICE YEAR.—Section 12733(3) of such title is amended by striking ''or (D)'' and inserting ''(D), or (F)''.

SA 1080. Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. _____. FINANCIAL AUDIT FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Department of Defense does not obtain a qualified audit opinion on its full financial statements for fiscal year 2020 by March 31, 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a fund to be known as the ''Financial Audit Fund'' (in this section referred to as the ''Fund'') for the purpose of activities for the resolution of Notices of Findings and Recommendations received.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Amounts in the Fund shall include the following:

(1) Amounts appropriated to the Fund.

(2) Amounts transferred to the Fund under subsection (d).

(3) Any other amounts authorized for transfer or deposit into the Fund by law.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available for activities for the resolution of Notices of Findings and Recommendations received.

(2) TRANSFERS FROM FUND.—Amounts in the Fund may be transferred to any other account of the Department in order to fund activities described in paragraph (1). Any amounts transferred from the Fund to an account shall be merged with amounts in the account to which transferred and shall be available subject to the same terms and conditions as amounts in such account. The authority to transfer amounts under this paragraph is in addition to any other authority of the Secretary to transfer amounts by law.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—Amounts in the Fund may be transferred under this subsection in a fiscal year only to agencies and organizations of the Department that have an obtained an unmodified audit opinion on their financial statements for at least one of the two preceding fiscal years. Amounts so transferred shall be available only to permit the agency or organization to which transferred to carry out activities described in paragraph (1).

(d) TRANSFERS TO FUND IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS.—

(1) REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AVAILABLE.—Subject to paragraph (2), if during any fiscal year after fiscal year 2021 the Secretary determines that an agency or organization of the Department has not achieved a qualified opinion on its full financial statements, is being identified as not audit ready, is receiving a disclaimer of opinion on its financial statements, or is receiving an adverse opinion on its financial statements for the calendar year ending during such fiscal year—

(A) the amount available to such agency or organization for the fiscal year in which such determination is made shall be equal to—

(i) the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such agency or organization for the fiscal year; minus

(ii) the lesser of—

(I) an amount equal to 0.5 percent of the amount described in clause (i); or

(II) $100,000,000; and

(B) the Secretary shall deposit in the Fund pursuant to subsection (b)(2) all amounts unavailable to agencies and organizations of the Department in the fiscal year pursuant to determinations made under subparagraph (A).

(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO AMOUNTS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL.—Any reduction applicable to an agency or organization of the Department under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year shall not apply to amounts, if any, available to such agency or organization for the fiscal year for military personnel.

(3) LIMITATION ON FUNDS TRANSFERRABLE.—The authority to transfer amounts pursuant to this subsection applies only with respect to amounts that are appropriated after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) REPORTS ON TRANSFERS.—Not later than 15 days before the transfer of any amount pursuant subsection (c)(2) or (d)(1)(B), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a notice on the transfer, including the agency or organization whose funds will provide the source of the transfer, the amount of the transfer, and the specific plans for the use of the amount transferred for the resolution of Notices of Findings and Recommendations concerned, as applicable.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''audit ready'', with respect to an agency or organization of the Department of Defense, means that the agency or organization has in place the critical audit capabilities and associated infrastructure necessary to successfully commence and support a financial audit of its relevant financial statements.

(2) The term ''adverse opinion'', with respect to financial statements, means an opinion by the auditor of the financial statements that the financial statements are misleading and cannot be relied upon.

(3) The term ''disclaimer of opinion'', with respect to financial statements, means that the auditor of the financial statements was not able to complete the audit work, and cannot issue an opinion, on the financial statements.

(4) The term ''qualified opinion'', with respect to financial statements, means an opinion by the auditor of the financial statements that the financial statements are reliable with certain exceptions.

(g) COORDINATING REPEAL.—Section 1008 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended by striking subsection (d).

SA 1081. Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. _____. LIMITATION ON REFUELING OF AIRCRAFT OF SAUDI ARABIA FOR OPERATIONS IN YEMEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the refueling of aircraft of Saudi Arabia for operations in Yemen until 14 days after the date on which the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, submits to the appropriate committees of Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States a certification described in subsection (b), together with a detailed justification for the certification.

(b) CERTIFICATION DESCRIBED.—A certification described in this subsection is a certification as follows:

(1) That the Government of Saudi Arabia is complying fully with its obligations in Yemen under each of the following:

(A) Customary international law rule 55.

(B) Articles 14 and 18 of the Additional Protocol (II) to the Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949.

(2) That the Government of Saudi Arabia is facilitating the delivery and installation of cranes to the port of Hodeidah that will expedite the delivery of humanitarian assistance.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the submittal of the certification described in subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing whether the conclusions in the certification are fully supported, and the justification for the certification pursuant to subsection (a) is sufficiently detailed, and identifying whether any shortcomings, limitations, or other reportable matters exist that affect the quality of the certification.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1082. Mr. STRANGE (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to Littoral Combat Ship, increase the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $600,000,000.

SA 1083. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 821, add the following:

(c) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT ON FRIVOLOUS BID PROTEST STANDARD.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report explaining how the Government Accountability Office interprets and implements subparagraph (A) of section 2340(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and, if warranted, providing recommendations on how to amend the frivolous protest standard defined pursuant to such subparagraph to make sure all relevant qualitative and quantitative factors are taken into account.

SA 1084. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ELIMINATION OF DEFENSE SEQUESTRATION.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Within'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (d), within'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Each'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (d), each'';

(C) in paragraph (4), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''If'' inserting ''Subject to subsection (d), if'';

(D) in paragraph (5), by striking ''If'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (d), if''; and

(E) in paragraph (6), by striking ''If'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (d), if''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) EXEMPTION OF REVISED SECURITY CATEGORY FROM SEQUESTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2018, and each fiscal year thereafter, if there is a breach within the revised security category—

''(A) there shall not be a sequestration within the revised security category; and

''(B) there shall be a sequestration within the revised nonsecurity category in the amount necessary to eliminate the breach within the revised security category.

''(2) ELIMINATION OF BREACH.—Any sequestration of the revised nonsecurity category under this subsection shall be implemented in accordance with subsection (a), as if the amount of the breach were a breach within the revised nonsecurity category.''.

SA 1085. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 342, line 16, insert after ''may'' the following: '', with the concurrence of the Secretary of State,''.

On page 342, beginning on line 18, strike '', with the concurrence of the Secretary of State,''.

On page 343, line 20, strike ''in consultation with'' and insert ''with the concurrence of''.

On page 343, line 25, strike ''in consultation with'' and insert ''with the concurrence of''.

On page 344, beginning on line 1, strike ''the congressional defense committees'' and insert ''the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives''.

On page 603, line 21, insert after ''may'' the following: '', with the concurrence of the Secretary of State,''.

On page 606, line 21, strike ''the congressional defense committees'' and insert ''the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives''.

On page 632, line 14, strike ''the congressional defense committees'' and insert ''the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives''.

On page 643, beginning on line 6, strike ''the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives'' and insert ''the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives''.

On page 729, beginning on line 7, strike ''the congressional defense committees'' and insert ''the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives''.

SA 1086. Mr. STRANGE (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1003 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to Littoral Combat Ship, increase the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $600,000,000.

In line 999 of the funding table in section 4301, in the item relating to Fuel Savings, increase the reduction $600 million.

SA 1087. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RECOGNITION OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF WORLD WAR II AVIATION.

(a) RECOGNITION.—The National Museum of World War II Aviation in Colorado Springs, Colorado, is recognized as America's National World War II Aviation Museum.

(b) EFFECT OF RECOGNITION.—The National Museum recognized by this section is not a unit of the National Park System, and the recognition of the National Museum shall not be construed to require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to the National Museum.

SA 1088. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. _____. TRAINING FOR NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL ON WILDFIRE RESPONSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force shall, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, provide for training of appropriate personnel of the National Guard on wildfire response, with preference given to States with the most acres of Federal forestlands administered by the U.S. Forest Service or the Department of the Interior.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense a total of $10,000,000, in addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated by sections 421 and 301, in order to carry out the training required by subsection (a) and provide related equipment.

(c) OFFSET.—In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to Fuzes, Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force, decrease the amount in the Senate Authorized column by $10,000,000.

SA 1089. Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. NELSON, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XVI, add the following:

Subtitle F—Cyber Scholarship Opportunities

SEC. 1661. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Cyber Scholarship Opportunities Act of 2017''.

SEC. 1662. COMMUNITY COLLEGE CYBER PILOT PROGRAM AND ASSESSMENT.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subtitle, as part of the Federal Cyber Scholarship-for-Service program established under section 302 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7442), the Director of the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall develop and implement a pilot program at not more than 10, but at least 5, community colleges to provide scholarships to eligible students who—

(1) are pursuing associate degrees or specialized program certifications in the field of cybersecurity; and

(2)(A) have bachelor's degrees; or

(B) are veterans of the armed forces.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subtitle, as part of the Federal Cyber Scholarship-for-Service program established under section 302 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7442), the Director of the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall assess the potential benefits and feasibility of providing scholarships through community colleges to eligible students who are pursuing associate degrees, but do not have bachelor's degrees.

SEC. 1663. FEDERAL CYBER SCHOLARSHIP-FOR SERVICE PROGRAM UPDATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7442) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b)(3) and inserting the following:

''(3) prioritize the employment placement of at least 80 percent of scholarship recipients in an executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code); and

''(4) provide awards to improve cybersecurity education at the kindergarten through grade 12 level—

''(A) to increase interest in cybersecurity careers;

''(B) to help students practice correct and safe online behavior and understand the foundational principles of cybersecurity;

''(C) to improve teaching methods for delivering cybersecurity content for kindergarten through grade 12 computer science curricula; and

''(D) to promote teacher recruitment in the field of cybersecurity.'';

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

''(d) POST-AWARD EMPLOYMENT OBLIGATIONS.—Each scholarship recipient, as a condition of receiving a scholarship under the program, shall enter into an agreement under which the recipient agrees to work for a period equal to the length of the scholarship, following receipt of the student's degree, in the cybersecurity mission of—

''(1) an executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code);

''(2) Congress, including any agency, entity, office, or commission established in the legislative branch;

''(3) an interstate agency;

''(4) a State, local, or tribal government; or

''(5) a State, local, or tribal government-affiliated non-profit that is considered to be critical infrastructure (as defined in section 1016(e) of the USA Patriot Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e)).'';

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) have demonstrated a high level of competency in relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities, as defined by the national cybersecurity awareness and education program under section 401;''; and

(B) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

''(4) be a full-time student in an eligible degree program at a qualified institution of higher education, as determined by the Director of the National Science Foundation, except that in the case of a student who is enrolled in a community college, be a student pursuing a degree on a less than full-time basis, but not less than half-time basis; and''; and

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

''(m) PUBLIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) EVALUATION.—The Director of the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall periodically evaluate and make public, in a manner that protects the personally identifiable information of scholarship recipients, information on the success of recruiting individuals for scholarships under this section and on hiring and retaining those individuals in the public sector cyber workforce, including on—

''(A) placement rates;

''(B) where students are placed, including job titles and descriptions;

''(C) student salary ranges for students not released from obligations under this section;

''(D) how long after graduation they are placed;

''(E) how long they stay in the positions they enter upon graduation;

''(F) how many students are released from obligations; and

''(G) what, if any, remedial training is required.

''(2) REPORTS.—The Director of the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Office of Personnel Management, shall submit, at least once every 3 years, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report, including the results of the evaluation under paragraph (1) and any recent statistics regarding the size, composition, and educational requirements of the Federal cyber workforce.

''(3) RESOURCES.—The Director of the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall provide consolidated and user-friendly online resources for prospective scholarship recipients, including, to the extent practicable—

''(A) searchable, up-to-date, and accurate information about participating institutions of higher education and job opportunities related to the field of cybersecurity; and

''(B) a modernized description of cybersecurity careers.''.

(b) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section, or an amendment made by this section, shall affect any agreement, scholarship, loan, or repayment, under section 302 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7442), in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this subtitle.

SEC. 1664. CYBERSECURITY TEACHING.

Section 10(i) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1(i)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

''(5) the term 'mathematics and science teacher' means a science, technology, engineering, mathematics, or computer science, including cybersecurity, teacher at the elementary school or secondary school level;''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (7) to read as follows:

''(7) the term 'science, technology, engineering, or mathematics professional' means an individual who holds a baccalaureate, master's, or doctoral degree in science, technology, engineering, mathematics, or computer science, including cybersecurity, and is working in or had a career in such field or a related area; and''.

SA 1090. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. _____. LIEUTENANT HENRY OSSIAN FLIPPER LEADERSHIP SCHOLARSHIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall designate a number of scholarships under the Army Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (SROTC) program that are available to students at minority-serving institutions as ''Lieutenant Henry Ossian Flipper Leadership Scholarships''.

(b) NUMBER DESIGNATED.—The number of scholarships designated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be the number the Secretary determines appropriate to increase the number of Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarships at minority-serving institutions. In making the determination, the Secretary shall give appropriate consideration to the following:

(1) The number of Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarships available at all institutions participating on the Senior Reserve Officer's Training Corps program.

(2) The number of such minority-serving institutions that offer the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program to their students.

(c) AMOUNT OF SCHOLARSHIP.—The Secretary may increase any scholarship designated pursuant to subsection (a) to an amount in excess of the amount of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program scholarship that would otherwise be offered at the minority-serving institution concerned if the Secretary considers that a scholarship of such increased amount is appropriate for the purpose of the scholarship.

(d) MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''minority-serving institution'' means an institution of higher education described in section 371(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067q(a)).

SA 1091. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. WICKER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 129, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO THE NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.).

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION OF DEAN JOHN A. KNAUSS MARINE POLICY FELLOWSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208(b) (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)) is amended by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''.

(b) PLACEMENTS IN CONGRESS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(2) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (1), in the second sentence, by striking ''A fellowship'' and inserting the following:

''(2) PLACEMENT PRIORITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In each year in which the Secretary awards a legislative fellowship under this subsection, when considering the placement of fellows, the Secretary shall prioritize placement of fellows in the following:

''(i) Positions in offices of, or with Members on, committees of Congress that have jurisdiction over the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

''(ii) Positions in offices of Members of Congress that have a demonstrated interest in ocean, coastal, or Great Lakes resources.

''(B) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—In placing fellows in offices described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall ensure that placements are equitably distributed among the political parties.

''(3) DURATION.—A fellowship''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to the first calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING FEDERAL HIRING OF FORMER FELLOWS.—It is the sense of Congress that in recognition of the competitive nature of the fellowship under section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)), and of the exceptional qualifications of fellowship awardees, the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, should encourage participating Federal agencies to consider opportunities for fellowship awardees at the conclusion of their fellowships for workforce positions appropriate for their education and experience.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO ACCEPT DONATIONS FOR NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 204(c)(4)(E) (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(E)) is amended to read as follows:

''(E) accept donations of money and, notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, of voluntary and uncompensated services;''.

(b) PRIORITIES.—The Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, shall establish priorities for the use of donations accepted under section 204(c)(4)(E) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(E)), and shall consider among those priorities the possibility of expanding the Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship's placement of additional fellows in relevant legislative offices under section 208(b) of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)), in accordance with the recommendations under subsection (c) of this section.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Sea Grant College Program, in consultation with the National Sea Grant Advisory Board and the Sea Grant Association, shall—

(1) develop recommendations for the optimal use of any donations accepted under section 204(c)(4)(E) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(E)); and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the recommendations developed under paragraph (1).

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or otherwise affect any other amounts available for marine policy fellowships under section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)), including amounts—

(1) accepted under section 204(c)(4)(F) of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(F)); or

(2) appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under section 212 of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1131).

SEC. 5. REDUCTION IN FREQUENCY REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL SEA GRANT ADVISORY BOARD REPORT.

Section 209(b)(2) (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''BIENNIAL'' and inserting ''PERIODIC'';

(2) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''The Board shall report to Congress at least once every four years on the state of the national sea grant college program and shall notify Congress of any significant changes to the state of the program not later than two years after the submission of such a report.''; and

(3) in the second sentence, by adding before the end period the following: ''and provide a summary of research conducted under the program''.

SEC. 6. MODIFICATION OF ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.

Section 204(b) (33 U.S.C. 1123(b)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''for research, education, extension, training, technology transfer, and public service'' after ''financial assistance''.

SEC. 7. DESIGNATION OF NEW NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGES AND SEA GRANT INSTITUTES.

Section 207(b) (33 U.S.C. 1126(b)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''EXISTING DESIGNEES'' and inserting ''ADDITIONAL DESIGNATIONS''; and

(2) by striking ''Any institution'' and inserting the following:

''(1) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS OF DESIGNATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 30 days before designating an institution, or an association or alliance of two or more such institutions, as a sea grant college or sea grant institute under subsection (a), the Secretary shall notify Congress in writing of the proposed designation. The notification shall include an evaluation and justification for the designation.

''(B) EFFECT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—The Secretary may not designate an institution, or an association or alliance of two or more such institutions, as a sea grant college or sea grant institute under subsection (a) if, before the end of the 30-day period described in subparagraph (A), a joint resolution disapproving the designation is enacted.

''(2) EXISTING DESIGNEES.—Any institution''.

SEC. 8. DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY; DEAN JOHN A. KNAUSS MARINE POLICY FELLOWSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—During fiscal year 2017 and any fiscal year thereafter, the head of any Federal agency may appoint, without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, other than sections 3303 and 3328 of that title, a qualified candidate described in subsection (b) directly to a position with the

Federal agency for which the candidate meets Office of Personnel Management qualification standards.

(b) DEAN JOHN A. KNAUSS MARINE POLICY FELLOWSHIP.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a former recipient of a Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship under section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)) who—

(1) earned a graduate or post-graduate degree in a field related to ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources or policy from an accredited institution of higher education; and

(2) successfully fulfilled the requirements of the fellowship within the executive or legislative branch of the United States Government.

(c) LIMITATION.—The direct hire authority under this section shall be exercised with respect to a specific qualified candidate not later than 2 years after the date that the candidate completed the fellowship described in subsection (b).

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(a) (33 U.S.C. 1131(a)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title—

''(A) $75,600,000 for fiscal year 2017;

''(B) $79,380,000 for fiscal year 2018;

''(C) $83,350,000 for fiscal year 2019;

''(D) $87,520,000 for fiscal year 2020;

''(E) $91,900,000 for fiscal year 2021; and

''(F) $96,500,000 for fiscal year 2022.''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) PRIORITY ACTIVITIES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017 THROUGH 2022.—In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2022 for competitive grants for the following:

''(A) University research on the biology, prevention, and control of aquatic nonnative species.

''(B) University research on oyster diseases, oyster restoration, and oyster-related human health risks.

''(C) University research on the biology, prevention, and forecasting of harmful algal blooms.

''(D) University research, education, training, and extension services and activities focused on coastal resilience and United States working waterfronts and other regional or national priority issues identified in the strategic plan under section 204(c)(1).

''(E) University research and extension on sustainable aquaculture techniques and technologies.

''(F) Fishery research and extension activities conducted by sea grant colleges or sea grant institutes to enhance, and not supplant, existing core program funding.''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.—Paragraph (1) of section 212(b) (33 U.S.C. 1131(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There may not be used for administration of programs under this title in a fiscal year more than 5.5 percent of the lesser of—

''(i) the amount authorized to be appropriated under this title for the fiscal year; or

''(ii) the amount appropriated under this title for the fiscal year.

''(B) CRITICAL STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall use the authority under subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, and under section 210 of this title, to meet any critical staffing requirement while carrying out the activities authorized under this title.

''(ii) EXCEPTION FROM CAP.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), any costs incurred as a result of an exercise of authority as described in clause (i) shall not be considered an amount used for administration of programs under this title in a fiscal year.''.

(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 204(d)(3) (33 U.S.C. 1123(d)(3)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''With respect to sea grant colleges and sea grant institutes'' and inserting ''With respect to sea grant colleges, sea grant institutes, sea grant programs, and sea grant projects''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''funding among sea grant colleges and sea grant institutes'' and inserting ''funding among sea grant colleges, sea grant institutes, sea grant programs, and sea grant projects''.

(2) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING DISTRIBUTION OF EXCESS AMOUNTS.—Section 212 (33 U.S.C. 1131) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

SEC. 10. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

The National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 204(d)(3)(B) (33 U.S.C. 1123(d)(3)(B)), by moving clause (vi) 2 ems to the right; and

(2) in section 209(b)(2) (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)(2)), as amended by section 6, in the third sentence, by striking ''The Secretary shall'' and inserting the following:

''(3) AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.—The Secretary shall''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 14, 2017 at 9:30 a.m., in 216 Hart Senate Office Building, in order to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nutrition Programs: Perspectives for the 2018 Farm Bill.''

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 14, 2017 at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Examining the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States.''

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 14, 2017, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Individual Tax Reform.''

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, in order to conduct a hearing entitled ''Stabilizing Premiums and Helping Individuals in the Individual Insurance Market for 2018: Health Care Stakeholders'' on Thursday, September 14, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 14, 2017, at 10 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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 Thursday, September 14, 2017, at 10 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing titled ''FCC's Lifeline Program: A Case Study of Government Waste and Mismanagement.''

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, September 14, 2017 from 9:30 a.m., in an offsite secure location to hold a closed Member briefing.

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 26, S. 129.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 129) to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wicker substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1091) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 129), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOBS FOR OUR HEROES ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 202, S. 1393.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1393) to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1393) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1393

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 ''Jobs for Our Heroes Act''.

SEC. 2. MEDICAL CERTIFICATE FOR VETERANS OPERATING COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) QUALIFIED EXAMINERS.—Section 5403(d)(2) of the FAST Act (49 U.S.C. 31149 note; 129 Stat. 1548) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) QUALIFIED EXAMINER.—The term 'qualified examiner' means an individual who—

''(A) is employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs as an advanced practice nurse, doctor of chiropractic, doctor of medicine, doctor of osteopathy, physician assistant, or other medical professional;

''(B) is licensed, certified, or registered in a State to perform physical examinations;

''(C) is familiar with the standards for, and physical requirements of, an operator required to be medically certified under section 31149 of title 49, United States Code; and

''(D) has never, with respect to such section, been found to have acted fraudulently, including by fraudulently awarding a medical certificate.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5403 of the FAST Act (49 U.S.C. 31149 note; 129 Stat. 1548) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''physician-approved veteran operator, the qualified physician'' and inserting ''veteran operator approved by a qualified examiner, the qualified examiner'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking ''the physician'' and inserting ''the examiner''; and

(B) by striking ''qualified physician'' and inserting ''qualified examiner'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''qualified physicians'' and inserting ''qualified examiners''; and

(B) by striking ''such physicians'' and inserting ''such examiners''; and

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (3), (1), and (2), respectively, and by moving the text of paragraph (3), as redesignated, to appear after paragraph (2), as redesignated; and

(B) in paragraph (3), as redesignated—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''PHYSICIAN-APPROVED VETERAN OPERATOR'' and inserting ''VETERAN OPERATOR APPROVED BY A QUALIFIED EXAMINER''; and

(ii) by striking ''physician-approved veteran operator'' and inserting ''veteran operator approved by a qualified examiner''.

(c) RULEMAKING.—The amendments made by this section shall be incorporated into any rulemaking proceeding related to section 5403 of the FAST Act (49 U.S.C. 31149 note; 129 Stat. 1548) that is being conducted as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE STANDARDS FOR CURRENT AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 31305(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''VETERAN OPERATORS'' and inserting ''OPERATORS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, RESERVISTS, OR VETERANS'';

(2) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''subparagraph (A) during, at least,'' and inserting ''subparagraph (A)—

''(i) while serving in the armed forces or reserve components; and

''(ii) during''; and

(3) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) by inserting ''current or'' before ''former'' each place the term appears; and

(B) by inserting ''one of'' before ''the reserve components''.

NO HUMAN TRAFFICKING ON OUR ROADS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 203, S. 1532.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1532) to disqualify from operating a commercial motor vehicle for life an individual who uses a commercial motor vehicle in committing a felony involving human trafficking.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1532) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1532

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 ''No Human Trafficking on Our Roads Act''.

SEC. 2. LIFETIME DISQUALIFICATION WITHOUT REINSTATEMENT.

Section 31310(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE VIOLATIONS'' and inserting ''LIFETIME DISQUALIFICATION WITHOUT REINSTATEMENT'';

(2) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''(1) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE VIOLATIONS.—The Secretary''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) HUMAN TRAFFICKING VIOLATIONS.—The Secretary shall disqualify from operating a commercial motor vehicle for life an individual who uses a commercial motor vehicle in committing a felony involving an act or practice described in paragraph (9) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)).''.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING IN COMMERCIAL VEHICLES ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 204, S. 1536.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1536) to designate a human trafficking prevention coordinator and to expand the scope of activities authorized under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's outreach and education program to include human trafficking prevention activities, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Combating Human Trafficking in Commercial Vehicles Act''.

SEC. 2. HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION COORDINATOR.

The Secretary of Transportation shall designate an official within the Department of Transportation who shall—

(1) coordinate human trafficking prevention efforts across modal administrations in the Department of Transportation and with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

(2) in coordinating such efforts, take into account the unique challenges of combating human trafficking within different transportation modes.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF OUTREACH AND EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Section 31110(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The program authorized under this subsection may support, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, the recognition, prevention, and reporting of human trafficking, while deferring to existing resources, as practicable.''.

SEC. 4. EXPANSION OF COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 31313(a)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''or'' at the end;

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

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

''(E) support, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, the recognition, prevention, and reporting of human trafficking; or''.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee on human trafficking.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Committee shall be composed of not more than 15 external stakeholder members whose diverse experience and background enable them to provide balanced points of view with regard to carrying out the duties of the Committee.

(2) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall appoint the external stakeholder members to the Committee, including representatives from—

(A) trafficking advocacy organizations;

(B) law enforcement; and

(C) trucking, bus, rail, aviation, maritime, and port sectors, including industry and labor.

(3) PERIODS OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Committee.

(4) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made and shall not affect the powers or duties of the Committee.

(5) COMPENSATION.—Committee members shall serve without compensation.

(c) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and appoint all members of the Committee.

(d) DUTIES.—

(1) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Committee shall make recommendations to the Secretary on actions the Department can take to help combat human trafficking, including the development and implementation of—

(A) successful strategies for identifying and reporting instances of human trafficking; and

(B) recommendations for administrative or legislative changes necessary to use programs, properties, or other resources owned, operated, or funded by the Department to combat human trafficking.

(2) BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall develop recommended best practices for States and State and local transportation stakeholders to follow in combating human trafficking.

(B) DEVELOPMENT.—The best practices shall be based on multidisciplinary research and promising, evidence-based models and programs.

(C) CONTENT.—The best practices shall be user-friendly, incorporate the most up-to-date technology, and include the following:

(i) Sample training materials.

(ii) Strategies to identify victims.

(iii) Sample protocols and recommendations, including—

(I) strategies to collect, document, and share data across systems and agencies;

(II) strategies to help agencies better understand the types of trafficking involved, the scope of the problem, and the degree of victim interaction with multiple systems; and

(III) strategies to identify effective pathways for State agencies to utilize their position in educating critical stakeholder groups and assisting victims.

(D) INFORMING STATES OF BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall ensure that State Governors and State departments of transportation are notified of the best practices and recommendations.

(e) REPORTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) submit a report on the actions of the Committee described in subsection (d) to—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and

(2) make the report under paragraph (1) publicly available both physically and online.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMITTEE.—The term ''Committee'' means the Department of Transportation Advisory Committee on Human Trafficking established under subsection (a).

(2) HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—The term ''human trafficking'' means an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or paragraph (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1536), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 256, S. Res. 257, S. Res. 258, and S. Res. 259.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, September 18; 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, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 2810, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2017, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:03 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 18, 2017, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

GLEN R. SMITH, OF IOWA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 21, 2022, VICE KENNETH ALBERT SPEARMAN, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

BRIAN D. MONTGOMERY, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE CAROL J. GALANTE.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

WALTER G. COPAN, OF COLORADO, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY, VICE WILLIE E. MAY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MATTHEW G. T. MARTIN, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RIPLEY RAND, RESIGNED.

MICHAEL B. STUART, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE R. BOOTH GOODWIN II, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

JAMES E. TRAINOR III, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 30, 2023, VICE MATTHEW S. PETERSEN, TERM EXPIRED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 14, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

PAMELA HUGHES PATENAUDE, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PETER E. DEEGAN, JR., OF IOWA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

MARC KRICKBAUM, OF IOWA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

D. MICHAEL DUNAVANT, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

LOUIS V. FRANKLIN, SR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JESSIE K. LIU, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

RICHARD W. MOORE, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

BART M. DAVIS, OF IDAHO, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

KURT G. ALME, OF MONTANA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DONALD Q. COCHRAN, JR., OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

RUSSELL M. COLEMAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

BRIAN J. KUESTER, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

R. TRENT SHORES, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

DANIEL J. KANIEWSKI, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on September 14, 2017 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

DANIEL ALAN CRAIG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE JOSEPH L. NIMMICH, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JULY 25, 2017.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT WILLIAM C. RYAN, JR.

HON. JOSH GOTTHEIMER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an American hero from New Jersey's Fifth District, First Lieutenant William C. Ryan, Jr. Lieutenant Ryan served our country as an aviator in the Marine Corps during the Vietnam War. For his heroism in combat, Lieutenant Ryan was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and Purple Heart. Lieutenant Ryan grew up in Bogota, New Jersey, and was an athlete and community leader at St. Cecilia's High School. Nicknamed ''Rhino'' for his toughness and composure, Lieutenant Ryan was a stern fighter and devoted family man. ''Billy,'' as he was known to his friends, attended St. Francis College, where he met Judy, who would become his wife.

Upon graduation, Billy answered the call to serve in the United States Marine Corps. His outstanding character, determination, and willingness to serve his country, made him a natural fit for flight school where he trained to become a Marine Aviator. While deployed in Vietnam, Lieutenant Ryan took on enemy fire and was once rescued in the South China Sea. On May 11, 1969, Lieutenant Ryan faced heavy enemy fire and was shot down again. He was pronounced dead on May 13, 1969.

On the same day that her husband was downed by heavy fire, Judy packed her bags eagerly awaiting a planned vacation with her husband. Their son Michael was just a few hours shy of his first birthday. For forty-seven years, Lieutenant Ryan, who is a hero, never received the proper burial he deserved. In 1990, investigators recovered Lieutenant Ryan's aircraft seat from the crash landing, and decades later, investigators recovered his remains in January 2016, bringing much-needed peace to his family. With the hero's welcoming that the Ryan family deserved, Billy was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery, on May 10, 2017.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the heroism of First Lieutenant William C. Ryan, Jr. and the Ryan family. His sacrifice, patriotism, and valor represent the best of New Jersey and our country.

COMMEMORATING 50 YEARS OF SOUTHWEST WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Southwest Wisconsin Technical College for providing opportunities for success through education for 50 years.

Before the first shovel of dirt was unearthed in a cornfield outside of Fennimore no one could have imagined what would someday stand there almost 50 years later; Wisconsin's No. 1 and the nation's No. 3 rated two-year college in 2017.

Founded in 1967, Southwest Tech is located in Fennimore, Wisconsin. Reflecting the job demand of the time, degree programs started with Auto-Tractor Mechanics and Welding programs, as well as Account Clerk and Clerk-Typists classes. As the economy changed, the college added degrees in Criminal Justice, Nursing, Physical Therapy Assistant, Midwifery, Web and Graphic Design, and Network Specialist.

The first graduation was in May 1969, with 104 graduates representing six programs. The May 2017 graduation had 366 graduates representing 41 programs. Southwest Tech has graduated 26,000 students in its history.

Southwest Tech is also a major employer in Grant County employing 324 people and working with numerous businesses in a nine county area. It is one of 16 two-year public open access institutions within the Wisconsin Technical College System. The college serves 3,800 square miles including 30 school districts in a five-county district of Crawford, Grant, Iowa, Lafayette, Richland and portions of Dane, Green, Sauk and Vernon Counties.

The college is currently under the leadership of President, Dr. Jason Wood. The first president of the college was Conrad Mayer, followed by Ronald Anderson, Dr. Richard Rogers, Dr. Karen Knox and Dr. Duane Ford.

Now, in 2017, Southwest Tech is proud to celebrate the many ways the College's mission and its graduates positively impact southwest Wisconsin. Thousands of Southwest Tech employees, partners, and supporters deliver excellence to their students, businesses, and communities. Because of their tireless efforts, they have forever changed the lives of those the college serves. Southwest Tech's 50th Anniversary is an exciting opportunity to reflect on the past, celebrate the present and move forward with a renewed dedication to students and southwest Wisconsin.

I extend my heartfelt congratulations to all the past and present faculty, staff, and students on 50 years of valuable and skillful higher education. Thanks to the efforts of current administration and those that have come before, Southwest Tech will continue to lead the way into the future.

HONORING THE INDO-AMERICAN HERITAGE MUSEUM GALA IN CHICAGO, ILLINOIS ON SEPTEMBER 16TH

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the Indo-American Heritage Museum in Chicago, Illinois as they celebrate their annual Gala.

The Indo-American Heritage Museum, located in the heart of Chicago's Indian American commercial district, is an inclusive, community-based institution where visitors can better understand and experience the cultural, historic, and contemporary development of millions of Americans of Indian origin.

The mission of the Indo-American Heritage Museum is to promote understanding of the heritage, culture and diversity of Indian Americans, preserve their history and share their contributions to the fabric of American life. Since 1994, IAHM has collaborated with other institutions in Chicago, such as the Field Museum and the Chicago Opera, to promote Indian culture and heritage, and it has created hundreds of presentations for students at K–12 schools and universities.

The 2017 Gala coincides with the showing of the Smithsonian's Beyond Bollywood exhibit in partnership with the Field Museum. The exhibition explores the heritage, daily experience and numerous, diverse contributions that Indian immigrants and Indian Americans have made to shaping the United States.

Beyond the broader impact that IAHM has, it is also personal to me. I was raised to be proud of being American, and I make sure my children understand every day to be proud of the United States. At the same time as we embrace our identities, we never forget from where we and our families came.

Today, India stands as a beacon for what can be achieved. Home to more than 1.3 billion people, India boasts the world's largest middle class and one of the world's biggest democracies. Meanwhile, India's reach extends far beyond her borders. Today, there are five Indian-American members of Congress including myself, and India has become one of the United States' largest trading partners. I see India's cultural influence every day in the U.S. Capitol, and in my very own district in Illinois.

I honor the Indo-American Heritage Museum as they celebrate their annual Gala.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNCONVENTIONAL RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION'S 27TH AMENDMENT

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gregory Watson of Texas' 25th Congressional District, and to recognize the 25th Anniversary this year of the unconventional ratification of the 27th Amendment to the Constitution in 1992. And just days from now, September 17, 2017, will mark the 230th Anniversary of our Constitution's drafting in Philadelphia during the year 1787.

The 27th Amendment is brief and to the point: ''No law, varying the compensation for

the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.''

A decade prior to the irregular ratification of the 27th Amendment, one of my constituents, Gregory Watson, was a 19-year-old student at the University of Texas at Austin tasked with writing a term paper for a course in American Government. Through his research, Watson stumbled upon a still-pending proposed constitutional amendment that the First Congress had offered in 1789, pursuant to Article V, to the State legislatures for ratification pertaining to the compensation of Members of Congress. Despite the intriguing nature and depth of research of his paper, Watson earned a grade of ''C'' on it, and in the class overall. That grade stood for 35 years until May 2017 when the overall course grade was officially raised to an ''A'' by UT–Austin upon formal petition of Watson's former professor.

Unfazed at the time by the original low grade on his paper, Watson began in the Spring of 1982 reaching out to seek sponsorship of the proposed constitutional amendment in state capitols across the United States. In 1983, the Maine Legislature became Watson's first success story. After that, in 1984, Colorado's lawmakers gave their approval at Watson's urging. And from that point forward—with Watson pressing every step of the way—the proposal's momentum strengthened until it officially became the 27th Amendment to the Constitution on May 5, 1992, when the Alabama Legislature approved it, just over 10 years after Watson first learned of it. Later that month, both Houses of the 102nd Congress voted to accept the 27th Amendment's unorthodox path to final ratification.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the story of a determined student should serve as a reminder of how much influence average citizens can have if they will step up and get involved in the political process.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT FOR ALL ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill I introduced earlier today: the Equal Employment for All Act. A companion bill was introduced in the Senate today by Senator ELIZABETH WARREN.

According to a recent report, an increasing number of employers have been using credit reports, specifically consumer reports bearing on the consumer's creditworthiness, credit standing or credit capacity, as part of their hiring process. However, unless the job position involves significant financial responsibility, the use of a credit check for employment raises the obvious issue that a person's credit history has little to do with his or her qualifications for a job.

Far too often, employers turn down ''credit challenged'' applicants because they have erroneously linked credit scores to potential job performance. Even worse, the ''credit challenged'' have fallen victim to deceptive marketing practices by credit report companies or credit counseling services that charge outlandish fees that supposedly rehabilitate credit scores to help with employment.

The Equal Employment for All Act would right this wrong by amending the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer credit checks by employers as part of the hiring or firing process unless the job involves national security, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation clearance, or significant financial responsibility.

With the passage of the Equal Employment for All Act, some of our most vulnerable, ''credit challenge'' citizens including students, recent college graduates, low-income families, senior citizens, and minorities, would be given the opportunity to begin rebuilding their credit by obtaining a job.

I also want to thank Senator WARREN for her leadership and partnership on this important piece of legislation.

I urge my colleagues to help pass this bill.

IN HONOR OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important milestone in my district on the central coast of California. This weekend will mark twenty-five years since the establishment of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. Referred to by many as the Serengeti of the Sea, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration designated the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary in 1992. Twenty-five years later, thanks in large part to this designation, the central coast of California has become a vibrant international tourist destination. Millions of people from all over the world now travel to my district to enjoy the pristine natural beauty of this Sanctuary, creating not only cherished memories for visitors, but also thousands of jobs for local residents Among these destinations is the Monterey Bay Aquarium, a world-renowned aquarium where thousands of visitors every year learn about the rare and diverse ecosystems that thrive within the giant kelp forests of the Sanctuary.

While several generations on the central coast of California have always known the Monterey Bay to be a place of protected natural beauty, a sanctuary designation was a long-delayed dream for many. While a Marine Sanctuaries Study Bill was first proposed in 1967, it was not until the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 that the Environmental Protection Agency was authorized by Congress to regulate commercial activities in offshore areas. Thus, Congress delegated power to the Executive Branch to create federally protected marine sanctuaries. Unfortunately, despite tireless local efforts to achieve this designation for the Monterey Bay, the Reagan administration dropped the area for consideration as a sanctuary in 1983. The Congressman at the time recalled recently that when he approached then- Interior Secretary James Watt to lobby for the designation, he pointed out a picture on the wall of the room of a beautiful coastline, using it as an example of the kinds of areas worthy of conservation. Secretary Watt allegedly replied, ''Looks like a good place for an oil rig.''

However, this did not stop the residents of the central coast from achieving their long-held dream. In 1988, Congress voted to re-authorize the Sanctuaries Act, and the Monterey Bay was included in the bill as a proposed sanctuary. It was an important step, but much work remained to make certain that the Sanctuary would be large enough to ensure the protection of the coastline from offshore oil drilling, and other practices that would harm the delicate ecosystem within the Monterey Bay. Finally, on September 18, 1992, Congress authorized the designation of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary through legislation proposed by Congressman Leon Panetta. My father has referred to this many times as one of his proudest moments, and it certainly stands as one of his greatest accomplishments.

Of course, the thanks for the establishment of the Sanctuary should not go to just one man. Rather, it was the culmination of decades of tireless work by hundreds of citizens and public servants. Their determination preserved a living postcard to pass on to the future generations. The endless hours dedicated to this monumental achievement stand as an enduring testament to what is possible when citizens take an active role in our democracy. When Americans put their minds to something, anything is possible.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in taking a moment to recognize the value of conserving areas like the Monterey Bay. Preserving our nation's natural beauty has a long and storied tradition spanning over a century, with champions from both political parties. Let us now, then, commit ourselves to the continued preservation of our nation's public lands, now and forever.

CONGRATULATING THE ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of the Alliance to Save Energy on its 40th Anniversary. Founded in 1977 following the oil embargo, the Alliance has been dedicated to improving the energy efficiency of the United States. It was established by Senators Charles Percy, a Republican from Illinois, and Hubert Humphrey, a Democrat from Minnesota, reflecting the organization's deep bipartisan roots and commitment to practical approaches to policy; a philosophy that guides the Alliance's work today.

The benefits of energy efficiency are broad. Not only does using less energy save money for American families and businesses on their utility bills, it allows our nation's valuable resources to last longer and produce more for our economy. When we can power our nation with domestic resources, we don't have to rely on foreign sources and the risks that accompany them. For this reason, energy efficiency and energy security are just as intricately linked as they were in 1977.

Improving energy efficiency in federal buildings remains one of my top priorities, particularly when it can be done through common-

sense, public-private partnerships and performance contracts that save taxpayer funds. Each and every time the energy efficiency of a federal building is improved, the taxpayer wins. When the private sector is engaged and deploys its resources to make those improvements, the taxpayer wins many times over. For this reason, I am proud of my work to support Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPCs) and Utility Energy Service Contracts (UESCs), including legislation I introduced along with my friend PETER WELCH of Vermont that would lead to more investments, better leverage of public funds, and greater savings. The Alliance endorses my bipartisan legislation and I am thankful for their support.

Again, congratulations to the Alliance on reaching its 40th Anniversary. It is truly an honor to serve on this organization's Honorary Board, along with my colleagues PETER WELCH of Vermont, MICHAEL BURGESS of Texas, DAVID MCKINLEY of West Virginia, DAVE REICHERT of Washington, and PAUL TONKO of New York, as well as several Senate colleagues. As a group, I believe we truly represent the diversity of opinions on energy issues in Congress, but we also represent the Alliance's strong commitment to bipartisanship. We've come a long way on federal energy efficiency policy, and I look forward to what can be accomplished over the next 40 years.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM J. ''BILL'' HOWELL

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize William J. ''Bill'' Howell for 30 years of distinguished public service to the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. Howell served in the Virginia General Assembly since 1988, and presided over the chamber as Speaker of the House of Delegates since 2003. During his tenure, Speaker Howell championed the issues important to his constituents of Stafford and Fredericksburg and on behalf of all Virginians. As the second longest serving Speaker in the House of Delegates, Mr. Howell embodied the characteristics of a true Virginia Statesmen.

Among other issues, Mr. Howell will be remembered for reforming the Virginia Retirement System and leading the first transportation funding overhaul in 27 years. Speaker Howell recognized the importance of the Chesapeake Bay and was a strong advocate for historical preservation and conservation efforts. Under Speaker Howell, Virginia's Rainy Day Fund is on track to exceed $1 billion by the end of the next budget cycle. In 2013, Speaker Howell was named ''Legislator of the Year'' by the Virginia Chamber of Commerce, and one of Governing Magazine's 2013 Public Officials of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Speaker Bill Howell on his dedication to serving the Commonwealth of Virginia and wishing him best wishes in his future endeavors.

THE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE IN LIBERIA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I held a hearing on the future of democracy and governance in Liberia. Of the more than 50 nations of Africa, the United States has the closest connection with the Republic of Liberia. This is not only because Liberia was founded in 1847 by freedmen and former slaves from this country, but also because of the estimated 500,000 Liberians and Liberian descendants who live here. Many Liberians consider the United States the ''mother country'' even though it was never a U.S. colony. Liberian cities such as Monrovia and Buchanan were named for American presidents.

However, most Americans are largely unaware of the long link between the United States and Liberia and likely see Liberia as just another African country. Most Americans are unaware that Liberia has been a major U.S. ally since World War II and into the Cold War, hosting U.S. communications facilities in the 1960s and 1970s and receiving extensive U.S. development assistance, including postwar aid and post-Ebola aid to Liberia. The United States also helped Liberia build its criminal justice sector and supported transitional justice efforts.

The United States has funded just over a quarter of the cost of the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), at a cost of $106 million annually as of FY 2016. Liberia is also implementing a $256.7 million, five-year MCC compact, signed in 2015, designed to increase access to reliable, affordable electricity and enhance the country's poor road infrastructure. Bilateral State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) assistance totaled $91 million in FY2016.

President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf has made some advancement in democracy and governance during her two terms, following the despotic rule of Charles Taylor. During his term of office, Taylor was accused of war crimes and crimes against humanity as a result of his involvement in the Sierra Leone civil war from 1991 to 2002, but he also was responsible for serious human rights violations in Liberia. Taylor was formally indicted by the Special Court for Sierra Leone in 2003. He resigned and went into exile in Nigeria. In 2006, then-newly elected President Sirleaf formally requested his extradition. He was detained by UN authorities in Sierra Leone and then at the Penitentiary Institution Haaglanden in The Hague, awaiting trial by the Special Court. He was found guilty in April 2012 of all eleven charges levied by the Special Court, including terror, murder and rape, and in May 2012, Taylor was sentenced to 50 years in prison.

The United States occasionally arrested alleged perpetrators of civil war human rights abuses, often using immigration perjury charges as a vehicle for prosecution. One of them was Charles McArther Emmanuel, also known as Chuckie Taylor, the son of Charles Taylor. Raised in Florida, Emmanuel became the commander of the infamously violent Anti-Terrorist Unit, commonly known in Liberia as the ''Demon Forces.'' He is currently serving a 97-year sentence back in Florida for his role in human rights violations carried out by the ATU.

President Sirleaf was unable under the constitution to run for a third term but unlike other African leaders, she did not push to change the constitution to allow a third term. We don't yet know whether her successors can or will continue an upward trend. Most candidates for President have highlighted corruption, but these candidates have platforms that are light on policy specifics. Consequently, my subcommittee's hearing this week was intended to examine the prospects for democracy and governance in Liberia following the October elections.

The United States is a key provider of technical assistance to Liberia's National Election Commission, including an International Foundation for Electoral Systems program, funded by USAID, and the U.N. Development Program, backed by nearly $12 million in mostly European Union funding under a multifaceted project from 2015 to 2018. The Election Commission also receives broader institutional capacity building support under a second $4 million USAID-funded program, the Liberian Administrative and System Strengthening.

Our government has a significant investment in Liberia on several fronts. The future direction of this country is important to the United States. Therefore, we have a stake in the next Liberian government building on advances made in democracy and governance under the current government and must continue to provide assistance to that end and insist on no backsliding as we see in far too many countries in Africa today.

Most of all, there must be much more done to minimize the impact of corruption in Liberia, which not only robs the people of the benefits of their country's resources and labor, but also discourages foreign investment that could provide a needed boost to development.

October's election will tell a lot about where Liberia is going, and we need to keep a close watch on developments in this important African ally.

HONORING TOM DRAPER

HON. LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the remarkable life of Delaware icon, Thomas H. Draper. Tom grew up in Milton, Delaware and spent his summers at the Delaware beaches. Tom went on to college at Brown University where he excelled, not only by earning his spot as captain of the 1964 Brown Bears lacrosse team, but also by being named an All-American before eventually earning admission to the Brown University Athletic Hall of Fame.

Tom returned to his home state of Delaware after college, moving back to Sussex County. He quickly purchased radio station WTHD and began his career in broadcasting. Tom would go on to purchase WBOC–TV in 1980 and helped build it into a broadcasting mainstay in ''The First State.''

To know Tom, however, was to know that he was so much more than his career, impressive as it was. Tom loved being outdoors and

spending time with his family. His four children and nine grandchildren were the light of his life, and what a life he led. Thomas Henry Draper passed away earlier this week at the age of 76, just a few weeks after he celebrated 50 years in broadcasting. We know that our little state had a place in Tom's big heart and we know that the legacy that Tom leaves behind will make a mark on Delaware for generations to come.

HONORING ELIZABETH ''LIBBY'' HERLAND

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, each year half a million people visit the Eastern Massachusetts National Wildlife Refuge Complex, eight individual wildlife refuges that are home to 30 miles of beautiful walking trails, canoe launches, treasured fishing spots, and peaceful scenic overlooks. Since 2003, Project Leader Elizabeth ''Libby'' Herland has been the steward of this 17,000-acre environmental jewel; a guardian of its remarkable landscape and a visionary who has helped protect six Federally-listed endangered and threatened species on eight refuges, which include many rivers and a portion of the ocean shore of Cape Cod.

Upon Libby's retirement on September 30, 2017, the Fish and Wildlife Service will lose one of its most dedicated and passionate officials. However, Libby's influence will remain visible and tangible for many years to come. Under Libby's supervision, the eight refuges that make up the Eastern Massachusetts National Wildlife Refuge Complex expanded outreach to urban areas, building on successful urban education programs in Lowell, Massachusetts, and expanded visitor facilities. Libby oversaw the construction of the Assabet River National Wildlife Refuge Visitor Center which hosts hundreds of school children year after year to learn about the natural wonders that surround them.

Libby dedicated herself to a lifetime of public service. During her 29-year career with the Fish and Wildlife Service, Libby served in a myriad of positions across the organization, from managing the Wallkill River National Wildlife Refuge in Sussex County, New Jersey to the Regional Partners for Wildlife Coordinator in Newton, Massachusetts.

After working closely with Libby for many years, I am profoundly appreciative of her commitment to wildlife, education, and her many years of effective leadership. Libby's visionary leadership will be missed across the East Coast of America.

I extend my sincerest thanks and congratulations to Libby on behalf of a grateful nation, and I am confident that even in retirement she will remain a steward of our environment.

CELEBRATING 100 YEARS OF FINNISH INDEPENDENCE

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as Co-Chair of the Congressional Friends of Finland Caucus to extend a warm welcome to Finnish President Sauli Niinistö, who is visiting Minnesota to celebrate Finland's upcoming 100th Independence Day, and attending FinnFest, an annual festival celebrating Finnish heritage and culture. FinnFest is held in cities across the U.S. and Canada, and this year Minnesota is especially honored to welcome the Finnish delegation in preparation for the 100th anniversary of Finland's independence later this year.

Minnesota is home to more than 60,000 Finnish-Americans, and our state's culture is enriched with many proud Finnish traditions and customs. Finnish Americans have established many Minnesota cities including Hibbing, Mountain Iron, Tower, Eveleth, and Virginia. Today, Finnish Americans continue to contribute to our state as leaders of industry, education, and local government.

It is truly an honor to represent so many proud Finnish-Americans in Congress, and to support our Nation's warm diplomatic relationship with Finland. Trade and tourism between our Nations continues to be mutually beneficial, with thousands of American's visiting Finland every year to experience Finnish culture firsthand, and explore Finland's many historic and beautiful sights.

Thank you President Niinistö for visiting our state and helping us celebrate Finnish heritage and culture during this very special year for your great Nation.

CELEBRATING THE ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Alliance to Save Energy on reaching its 40th anniversary and recognize their tireless efforts to improve the energy efficiency and increase the energy productivity of the United States. For four decades, the Alliance has worked with members of the House and Senate, of both parties, and every President and administration to find common ground around the idea of ''using less and doing more''. The Alliance has contributed to every major and minor piece of legislation dealing with energy efficiency passed by Congress and enacted into law since 1977. Simply put, without the Alliance, our economy would use more energy and do so less efficiently and productively.

The Alliance is a national, not-for-profit, public-policy organization that works on a bipartisan basis with policymakers and with prominent leaders in the fields of business, education, the environment and sustainability, and consumer affairs. The Alliance focuses its efforts on policies that promote the efficient use of energy throughout the world to benefit the economy, environment, and security of the United States. And to do so, it leverages its own network to cultivate coalitions that endure for years.

Over the past 40 years, energy efficiency policies pursued and conservation measures taken by the United States have caused annual energy consumption to decrease by more than 60 quads (quadrillion British thermal units) and saved American consumers and businesses $800 billion annually. And since the Alliance's establishment by Senators Charles Percy of Illinois and Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota in 1977, the United States has doubled its energy productivity, which means that today our economy produces twice as much gross domestic product per each unit of energy consumed. That is staggering, especially when considering the myriad ways the energy sector has evolved and our own lives, behaviors, and habits have changed.

Energy efficiency has enjoyed bipartisan support since the first policies were enacted in the wake of the oil crises of the 1970s. And much of that support hinges on the fact that energy efficiency is a reliable engine of job creation. Today, according to the United States Department of Energy, the energy efficiency sector now employs 2.2 million Americans. In Vermont, about 9,000 men and women are employed in the energy efficiency sector. Over half of this workforce is employed by small businesses. And in most cases, these are local jobs that are not readily exported or handled by workers overseas.

For the past four years, I have been a member of the Alliance's Honorary Board. My involvement in the Alliance's work reflects my belief in the importance of federal energy efficiency policy. It also lends me a platform to work with my colleagues to find bipartisan solutions to many challenges facing our modern—and modernizing—energy sector. I am honored to serve on the Alliance's Honorary Board along with colleagues Representatives MICHAEL BURGESS of Texas, ADAM KINZINGER of Illinois, DAVID MCKINLEY of West Virginia, DAVE REICHERT of Washington, and PAUL TONKO of New York.

The Alliance should be proud of its first 40 years. But the next 40 years will be even more important as we advance the energy efficiency policies we need to address the unprecedented challenge of global climate change. The Alliance and its diverse and committed coalition will be on the leading edge of what comes next in energy efficiency. It is my privilege to be part of the Alliance's efforts. Congratulations to Alliance on its 40 years of achievements, and good luck for its future endeavors.

COMMENDING LAKE COUNTY VETERANS AND FAMILY SERVICES FOUNDATION

HON. BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to commend the Lake County Veterans and Family Services Foundation (LCVFSF) and the important work they do throughout the Tenth District to support veterans and their families.

LCVFSF plays a critical role in our community by connecting veterans with each other and the resources they need, as well as educating and counseling families to support veterans and service members. LCVFSF offers peer support and nurturing connections for veterans through programs such as the Cup-A-Joe coffee meetup, as well as close collaboration with the Dryhootch Drop-in Center and Catholic Charities to help find jobs for veterans.

This year, LCVFSF and its innovative approach to wellness were recognized by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) for their work, Fostering Healing and Recovery through Connection.

During this National Suicide Prevention Week, LCFSF deserves particular acknowledgement. Every day in the United States, an average of 20 veterans die by suicide. Each of their deaths is a tragedy. We owe it to the fine men and women who served us, and who may still bear the physical and often invisible mental scars of that service, to support them after they retire the uniform.

Later this month, LCVFSF is partnering with the Student Veterans Club of College of Lake County to lead a Ruck March to raise awareness of the epidemic of veteran suicide. Participants will march more than 20 kilometers from North Chicago to Grayslake in memory of the veterans lost every day to suicide. Many will walk with ruck sacks representing the symbolic weight carried by those who have fallen due to suicide and those who suffer from their loss.

For all their efforts to improve the lives of our veteran community and address the tragedy of veteran suicide, I thank the staff, volunteers, and supporters of the Lake County Veterans and Family Services. I wish them much success on the upcoming Ruck March and look forward to continuing to work with the Foundation in the days ahead.

HONORING NICHOLAS PAYTON

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, trumpeter and composer Nicholas Payton will be honored this year by the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation at the Jazz Concert that will take place during the 47th Annual Legislative Conference. Mr. Payton will perform at the concert with bassist Ben Williams, who will present his Protest Anthology. The concert will take place on Thursday, September 21, 2017, at the Walter E. Washington Convention Center, in Washington, DC. Mr. Payton will also receive the 2017 CBCF ALC Jazz Legacy Award for his contributions to jazz and world culture. To acquaint you with his accomplishments, I am pleased to share the following biographical information from Mr. Payton's website.

Like a master chef possessing a deft sense of proportion, taste and poetic flair, this forward-looking heir to the traditions of New Orleans blends an array of related musical food groups—Bebop, Swing, the Great American Songbook, New Orleans second-line, Mardi Gras Indian, Instrumental Soul, Rhythm-and-Blues, Urban, Hip-Hop, and various Afro-descended dialects of Central America and the Caribbean—into a focused sound that is entirely his own argot.

On his latest recording Afro-Caribbean Mixtape, propelled by keyboardist Kevin Hays, bassist Vicente Archer, drummer Joe Dyson, percussionist Daniel Sadownick, and turntablist DJ Lady Fingaz, Payton seamlessly coalesces his interests, drawing on a global array of beats, melodies and harmonic consciousness to serve his lifelong conviction that music is a process by which the practitioner uses notes and tones to map identity and tell a story.

Payton states, ''I've incorporated elements from all the things I've written and spoken about for years. It speaks to the moment politically in an overt way that my other albums don't. On a musical-conceptual level, I think it's my greatest work thus far.''

Payton's aspiration to reclaim and redefine Black American Music fundamentals is a fulfillment of his birthright. He grew up across the street from Louis Armstrong Park, historically known as Congo Square, situated deep in the Treme, the neighborhood home base of many seminal New Orleans musicians and artists. In the 19th century, on Sundays only, enslaved Africans were allowed to gather in the public space of Congo Square to openly express African culture through singing, dancing and the playing of drums. Payton's mother, Maria, is a former operatic singer and a classically-trained pianist, who at 70, still performs in church; his father Walter, a bassist-sousaphonist and music educator was a mainstay on the Crescent City music and recording scene. He would take his young son to gigs. He gifted Nicholas a trumpet when he was four.

''Our house became a rehearsal space for whatever band my father was in,'' Payton recalls. ''We had a big living room and a grand piano, and other instruments. Trumpet appealed to me most of all the instruments I saw around, and I got one for Christmas when I was four.'' In just his childhood, Payton also became a proficient practitioner of tuba, trombone, woodwinds, piano, bass and drums. Before the age of 9, he sat-in with the Young Tuxedo Brass Band, a unit formed at the turn of the century that specialized in traditional repertoire. By 11, he received his first steady gig in the All Star Brass Band, a group of peers led by Trombone Shorty's oldest brother, James Andrews, who were deeply influenced by the rhythmic and harmonic extensions of various bands. Mardi Gras Indian music was in his back yard, and he played no small number of rhythm-and-blues and hip-hop sessions. ''I played all sorts of music,'' Payton says. ''I did everything.''

As a small child, Payton took as role models the ''kool kats'' who attended his father's wee-hours rehearsals: drummers James Black and Herlin Riley; saxophonists Fred Kemp and Earl Turbinton; trumpeter Clyde Kerr, Jr.; and pianists Ellis Marsalis and Professor Longhair.

Not long after joining the All Star Brass Band, Payton started digging into his father's record collection and came across Miles Davis' Four and More, with George Coleman, Herbie Hancock, Ron Carter and Tony Williams. ''I put on the second side first, and from the moment I heard Tony's 8-bar intro on sock cymbal, I was like, 'I want to play music for the rest of my life.' I listened to that record every day, to the point where I learned all the solos. I wasn't trying to transcribe them. I'd just listened to it so much that I learned all the music, every bassline, everything.''

''After that, I listened to Freddie Hubbard, Red Clay, and then I went to Clifford Brown. Then I went to Louis Armstrong, who I wasn't really into at the time. Even though I was playing in brass bands, I saw myself as doing something more modern. Wynton Marsalis and Terence Blanchard were my hometown heroes. I wanted to go to New York and play with Art Blakey, and do what they did. But Wynton told me, 'All that stuff you're checking out is cool, but you need to check out Pops.' I was like, 'Man, I don't want to listen to that Uncle Tom music.' I thought about the handkerchiefs and bucking eyes, the things that were shameful and debilitating to Black people, and I didn't want any part of it. But through Wynton's influence, I started investigating Armstrong, and found Pops was the catalyst for all of this other stuff that I love and listen to. I developed a simpatico.''

On the strength of his New Orleans upbringing and various concert appearances playing Armstrong repertoire on Jazz at Lincoln Center engagements with Marsalis, Payton—who had already established bona fides as a consequential modernist trumpet voice as a member of Elvin Jones-led ensembles on various tours and albums (Youngblood, Going Home and It Don't Mean A Thing)—was soon branded as ''the second coming of Armstrong.''

With the 2001 Armstrong homage, Dear Louis, Payton said ''farewell to a perspective on playing music in terms of a repertory view of the masters,'' and hello to the notion ''that I would solely create music from my perspective as a young man in this world today.'' That perspective, he adds, ties directly to his formative New Orleans experiences.

In 2014, Payton changed the name of his label from BMF to Paytone and released a trilogy of albums—Numbers, Letters, and Textures—that showcase the fruits of his decision a decade earlier to eschew the practice of writing tunes in favor of ''creating moods, distilling the compositional element to its most essential thing.'' He said: ''If a melody comes into my head while walking through an airport, I'll hum it into my Voice-Memo. If I dream a melody at night, I'll walk to the keyboards in my bedroom and play it into my phone or recorder. I stockpile these ideas, and quite an accumulation of motific themes have built up.''

Payton's ability to infuse early 20th century repertoire with idiomatic authority and life force elicited a comment from the late trumpeter Adolphus ''Doc'' Cheatham, who shared bandstands with the seminal pioneers of the 1920s and beyond, and was 91 when he recorded the Grammy-winning Doc Cheatham & Nicholas Payton in 1996. Doc described Payton, ''He is the greatest of the New Orleans-style trumpet players that I've ever heard. And every time I hear him, he sounds better and better. I haven't heard anybody like him since Louis Armstrong.''

Mr. Speaker, Nicholas Payton is a living jazz treasure and I urge all members to join me in commending him for his magnificent contribution to American and world culture.

APPLAUDING UNANIMOUS PASSAGE OF AMENDMENT TO PREVENT FEDERAL FUNDING FROM GOING TO UNSAFE CHILD CARE CENTERS

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Labor HHS Appropriations Subcommittee for accepting the amendment I introduced with Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT earlier this week. My amendment would prevent the flow of Child Care Development Block Grants to any child care providers with a record of health and safety violations that have resulted in injury or death at their centers. This amendment was drafted following the tragic death of five-year old Kamden Johnson at an unlicensed daycare center in my home state of Alabama.

For those of you who have not heard his story, Kamden Johnson died this August after being left in a hot daycare van at the preschool he was attending. His body was found later that day dumped at the side of the road.

Kamden's story is heartbreaking. First, because a young life was cut tragically short. Secondly, Kamden's death was preventable. Due to a state exemption for religious affiliated daycare centers, Kamden's daycare center was not subject to state oversight or inspections. As a matter of fact, the driver who was responsible for Kamden when he died had an extensive criminal record.

Despite Kamden's death, and despite the failure of Kamden's daycare center to meet commonsense safety standards, the childcare provider and other unregulated childcare centers like it can be eligible today for federal grant funding. After one of their children was discovered dead by the side of the road, this daycare center can still receive Child Care Development Block Grants.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, safe childcare centers which care for their children and are subject to regular inspection are struggling to make ends meet. Just this year, available slots at Head Start Programs were cut in four counties in my district. Each of the slots cut represent one more child who will not receive an early education, or who may be forced to attend an unlicensed daycare facility that puts their health and safety at risk.

I am a believer that Congress should act to increase funding for Head Start and that funding early learning is one of the best investments we can make in our country's future. But at a time when funding for early learning is limited, it is our responsibility to ensure that federal resources are going to the best possible daycares and preschools.

As of last year, there were 943 daycare centers in Alabama exempt from basic licensing standards. Over 30 Alabama legislators have come together to support a bipartisan bill extending licensing requirements to facilities currently exempt.

Right now, we have an opportunity to ensure that not one more federal dollar goes to a daycare center like the one that Kamden died at. We have a chance for both parties to work together and ensure that federal dollars for early learning are headed to child care centers that parents can trust meet basic health and safety standards.

My amendment is a commonsense fix following a tragedy that we cannot and should not allow to happen again. Kamden's death this August was not the first child death at an unregulated daycare center in my state, and it will not be the last so long as we continue to fund centers that violate health and safety standards. For our children, for our parents, and for kids like Kamden, I know that we can and must do better.

I am proud that Congress has taken a step in addressing this major oversight in the funding of our nation's day care centers.

There is nothing more important to me than seeing our children learn and grow, and that starts with making sure our resources for early learning are going to the right place.

REMEMBERING CHRISTOPHER PATTI

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Christopher Patti, who served as the Chief Counsel for the University of California, Berkeley, and was a well-respected member of the East Bay community. Mr. Patti died as a result of a vehicle accident on August 27th.

Mr. Patti graduated from Dartmouth College in 1980, before receiving his law degree from the University of Virginia in 1983, where he also served as the editor of the Virginia Law Review.

After graduation, he clerked for Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr. of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th District, and later embarked on a career in litigation at Heller, Ehrman, White & McAuliffe in San Francisco.

After a few years as a litigation attorney, Mr. Patti changed course and left private practice for public service. In 1990, he joined the University of California (UC) system, working as an attorney in the Office of the General Counsel for the UC Office of the President from 1990 through 2010.

In 2010, he moved from the Office of the President to serve as the Chief Campus Counsel at the University's flagship campus in Berkeley. Since his appointment to this position, he distinguished himself by guiding the campus through very challenging times, and developed a reputation among his peers as someone who "represented the best of Berkeley".

Mr. Patti's commitment to public service and public education, and his career working to support the important mission that the University plays in the East Bay, and worldwide is certainly a testament to that fact.

UC Berkeley Chancellor Carol Christ recalled of Patti that he was "extraordinary . . . and he had a deep core of integrity that motivated everything that he did".

I am grateful for Christopher Patti's service to the UC system, and the Berkeley campus in particular, and to the people of California. As a proud UC Berkeley alumna, I am tremendously saddened by this significant loss to the campus community.

Beyond his many professional accomplishments, Mr. Patti was a loving husband, and father who is survived by his wife, Jocelyn Larkin, and two sons, Vincent and Gabriel.

Today, on behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, I salute the life and service of Mr. Christopher Patti. I offer my sincere condolences to his family and friends, and the entire UC Berkeley community who are joined in grief at this incredible, and unfortunate loss.

HONORING ALBERTO GONZALES

HON. DON BACON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Hispanic Heritage Month by honoring a dedicated community leader from Nebraska's Second Congressional District with an inspirational story. Alberto "Beto" Gonzales' countless stories of overcoming adversity and selfless contribution to the youth of our Hispanic community, serve as a shining example and model for current and future generations.

Mr. Gonzales grew up in the Hispanic neighborhoods of South Omaha, where his father worked in the thriving meat packing industry. His mother cared for him and his six brothers and sisters and was a positive influence in their lives. As a Christian, she also believed in the power of prayer in daily life. Unfortunately, Alberto fell into drugs, alcohol, and eventually depression and thoughts of suicide.

By the time Beto was 11 years old he was already part of his first street gang and in 1977, spent five days in jail for a knife fight where he was defending himself against several male attackers. Had an observer not testified in his defense, he would have likely spent 30 years or more in jail.

At the age of 23, Alberto met a woman who would become one of his most influential mentors; Sister Joyce Englert with the Chicano Awareness Center in South Omaha. Through her efforts, Beto learned about Christ and was able to get off drugs permanently. His memories of his mother praying for him as a child helped him to make the positive life changes. As a result, Beto committed the rest of his life to helping young people overcome the obstacles and influences of living in poverty, as well as the intense peer pressure from gangs. His commitment was sealed in a tattoo on his arm of the scripture found in Psalms 23:4.

Alberto struggled with academics and barely made it through high school, but Sister Joyce was an instrumental part in helping him overcome a learning disability, teaching him to read and write, and eventually convincing him to enroll at Metro Community College in 1983. He recalls being more scared to pick up a college book than a gun. Though Beto took longer than most to complete his Associates Degree in Chemical Dependency, his perseverance would pay off later in his professional career.

As gang and drug activity exploded in South Omaha in the late '80s and 90s, so did the opportunities for Beto to help endangered youth in that community. While most who work in this field burn out after seven years, Alberto has served in this area for more than 32 years. Beto ran drug and alcohol treatment groups while doing extensive outreach with schools through the Chicano Awareness Center. After that, Alberto served as a National

Crisis Hotline Counselor for Boystown and eventually became an Omaha Police Department School Liaison, and Gang Prevention and Intervention Specialist where he still works today. Today Beto also develops and implements outreach programs for at-risk youth as a Youth Counselor for the South Omaha Boys and Girls Club. Through all these efforts, Alberto Gonzales has touched and changed the lives of hundreds, if not thousands of youth in the Hispanic community.

Mr. Gonzales' outstanding accomplishments have earned him several prestigious awards including the Friedman Award for Excellence in Youth Mentoring, Nebraska Hispanic Man of the Year Award, Induction into the Omaha South High School Alumni Hall of Fame, and many others. Alberto has taught us all that how you start out in life is not as important as how you finish. He has taught us we can never give up on the youth in our community, no matter the darkness of their current situation or their past.

Alberto gives credit to God, his mother who always prayed for him, his mentor Sister Joyce, and many of the educators and professionals who encouraged him along the way. He believes that showing unconditional positive regard and spending quality time with at-risk children can make a positive difference. He may not save every kid he encounters, but he believes in a philosophy that says, ''If you plant a seed now, someone else might water and grow it later.''

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MERIDEN RECORD-JOURNAL

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Meriden Record-Journal on the 150th Anniversary of its inaugural publication. This paper has been a staple of the Meriden community for the past century and a half, and its leaders have played a crucial role in informing the town.

The Record-Journal traces its history to The Weekly Visitor newspaper first published in 1867. In 1892, E.E. Smith, along with Thomas Warnock, acquired the paper and began a family legacy of running the local publication for four generations. Smith's son, Wayne, succeeded his father as publisher, and following Wayne's death in 1966, his stepson Carter White served as publisher until his retirement in 1988. What's more, various members of the family worked as writers, editors, and managers for the paper, contributing to the paper's success.

Though the Record-Journal has a long history in Meriden, its leaders have not been afraid to innovate and develop new practices to modernize the publication. RJ Media Group, which now publishes the paper, has been a leader in online, social media, and multimedia news in Connecticut. In fact, Editor & Publisher trade magazine named the Record-Journal as one of the ''10 Newspapers That Do It Right'' in March 2016, recognizing the hard work of the publication's leadership to keep the paper relevant for today's readers.

Mr. Speaker, the Meriden Record-Journal has been an important community institution for a century and a half, connecting and informing the town of Meriden. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor it, and all the leaders who have ensured its success here today.

HONORING CHERYL JENNINGS

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of longtime Bay Area anchor and reporter Cheryl Jennings on the occasion of her recognition by the International Association of Sufism with its Humanitarian Award on September 22, 2017. Ms. Jennings has dedicated her entire career to spreading humanity throughout the Bay Area and across the world, and it is fitting for her to receive this honor.

Born in Fort Benning, Georgia, to an Army family, Ms. Jennings lived in many places as a child around the U.S. and the world. This spurred in her a lifelong interest in travel and contributed to the development of her strong will, compassion, and strength. Ms. Jennings' successful career in broadcasting includes many achievements, including nine Emmy awards, seven ''Gracie'' awards from the Alliance of Women in Media, and many other honors and citations.

Her work at ABC 7/KGO has included frightening and memorable episodes. During the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, for example, she was the sole reporter in the studio, relaying critical information to a very scared public for hours. For this coverage, Ms. Jennings and her news team were awarded two of the highest broadcasting awards in the nation: the George Foster Peabody Award and the Radio-Television News Directors Association's Edward R. Murrow award.

In addition to her professional achievements, Ms. Jennings has volunteered her time to support numerous local charities and organizations over the years. For the past 15 years, she has been a stalwart supporter of Roots for Peace and has traveled around the world promoting landmine removal for countless families and communities. From Camp Okizu for children with cancer, to Performing Stars of Marin, to Marin Abused Women's Services, countless individuals and communities have been touched by her generosity and heart.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in expressing deep appreciation for Cheryl Jennings' humanitarian contributions, and in sending her best wishes for many more years of exceptional service.

HONORING HALIFAX COMMUNITY COLLEGE ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Halifax Community College located in my congressional district in Halifax County, North Carolina in the Town of Weldon as the institution celebrates its 50th Founders' Day and installs its new president, Dr. Michael Elam. Since its inception 50 years ago, Halifax Community College has served as a cornerstone of the Roanoke Valley region and has been a source of pride for the community.

What would eventually become Halifax Community College was first called Halifax County Technical Institute and was chartered by the North Carolina General Assembly on September 7, 1967. Originally located on US Highway 301 in Halifax, the school, led by its first president Dr. Phillip W. Taylor, first opened its doors to students in February 1968. The school remained in its original location until 1977 when it relocated to its present location on NC Highway 158 in the Town of Weldon.

Mr. Speaker, since its humble beginnings half a century ago, Halifax Community College has become known statewide for its innovative facilities and educational excellence in the Roanoke Valley. The institution serves more than 7,000 students each year and offers more than 40 academic programs that lead to certificates, diplomas and associate degrees. Halifax Community College offers basic literacy skills, workforce and human resources development, and continuing education programs. It is also home to the renowned 1,500-seat multipurpose theater called The Centre.

The staff of Halifax Community College work in earnest each day to achieve the school's mission ''to meet the diverse needs of [the] community by providing high-quality, accessible and affordable education and services for a rapidly changing and globally competitive marketplace.''

In recognition of its hard work and achievements, Halifax Community College has been the recipient of many prestigious awards including the 2015 Southern Region Equity Award by the Association of Community College Trustees; 2016 Advancing Diversity Award by the American Association of Community Colleges; 2016 Rural Community College Alliance Innovator Award; and 2017 American Association of Community Colleges Community College Safety, Planning, and Leadership Award.

Mr. Speaker, Halifax Community College is a vibrant, student-oriented institution that continues to embrace student learning and success as its top priorities. Under the visionary leadership of past presidents Dr. Phillip W. Taylor (1967–1988), Dr. Elton L. Newbern Jr. (1988–1998), Dr. Theodore H. Gasper Jr. (1998–2006), and Dr. Ervin V. Griffin Sr. (2006–2017), Halifax Community College has prospered and has transformed educational opportunities and outcomes for the Roanoke Valley.

I have no doubt that Halifax Community College's new president, Dr. Michael Elam, will build on the work of those who came before him and will ably and skillfully lead the institution into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the staff and students of Halifax Community College, past and present, as they celebrate 50 years of excellence in education. On behalf of the United States House of Representatives and the people of the First Congressional District of North Carolina, I wish Halifax Community College great success for the next 50 years and beyond.

RECOGNITION OF EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICERS AND INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITH 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HOUSE AND RECIPIENTS OF THE HOUSE EMPLOYEE EXCELLENCE AWARD AND THE OFFICERS' AND INSPECTORS GENERAL'S TEAM PLAYER AWARD

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, today, Ranking Member ROBERT BRADY and I wish to recognize the exceptional employees of the Officers (Clerk of the House, Sergeant at Arms, and Chief Administrative Officer) and the Inspector General of the U.S. House of Representatives, and congratulate those who have reached the milestone of 25 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives, as well as the recipients of the House Employee Excellence Award and the Officers' and Inspector General's Team Player Award.

The House's most important asset is its remarkable and steadfast employees, whose work is essential to keeping the operations and services of the House running efficiently and effectively. The employees we acknowledge today are commended for their hard work, dedication, professionalism, and teamwork; support of House Members, their staffs, and their constituents, and for their contributions day-in and day-out to the overall operations of the House. These employees, whose work is often performed behind the scenes, possess a wide range of responsibilities and skills that support the legislative process, ensure the security of this great institution, maintain our technology and service infrastructure, and contribute to more efficient and productive House support operations. These dedicated employees have accomplished many great things in a diverse range of activities, and the House of Representatives, its Members, staff, and the American public are better served because of them.

We recognize and honor the individuals named below for 25 years of loyal service to the House. Collectively, the employees listed below have provided 350 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Lisa Alvey, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Kevin Brennan, Office of the Sergeant at Arms;

William Crudup III, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Sharon Ellis-Gregg, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

John Hodges, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Derek Johann, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

William Michalek, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Louis Miller Jr., Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Michael Modica, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Christopher Naughton, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Todd Redlin, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Ronald Simmons, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Tammy Taft, Office of the Clerk;

Louis Williams Jr., Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

We also recognize and congratulate the House employees receiving the House Employee Excellence Award. This award is merit based; given to one employee from each House Officer organization, and the Office of Inspector General. Selected employees exhibited outstanding overall job performance and displayed a willingness to go above and beyond the requirements of their job for their organization throughout the last year. We honor the individuals named below for receiving this prestigious award.

Steven Johnson, Office of Inspector General;

Diana Rodriguez, Office of the Sergeant at Arms;

Robert Rota Jr., Office of the Clerk;

Angelisa Sarnowski, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

And finally, we recognize and congratulate the House employees being presented the Team Player Award. This award recognizes the value the House Officers and the Inspector General place on working collaboratively across House organizations to strengthen and protect the U.S. House of Representatives. These awardees have demonstrated a collaborative attitude, commitment to achieving team objectives, respect and support of their teammates, and dedication to the betterment of House operations. We honor the individuals named below for receiving this distinguished award.

Kim Arenas, Office of the Sergeant at Arms;

Karen McKinstry, Office of the Clerk;

Joseph Picolla, Office of Inspector General;

Timothy Wright, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

On behalf of the entire House community, we offer our congratulations and once again acknowledge and thank these employees for their professionalism and commitment to the U.S. House of Representatives as a whole, and in particular to their respective House Officers, the Inspector General, and collaboratively across these organizations. Their long hours, hard work, diverse skills, and team spirit are invaluable, and their years of unwavering service, dedication, and commitment to the House set an example for their colleagues and other employees who will follow in their footsteps. We celebrate our honorees, and we are proud to stand before you and the nation on their behalf to recognize the importance of their public service.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BETTER LIFE IN RECOVERY

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Better Life in Recovery, an organization located in Springfield, Missouri. Founded by David Stoecker, this organization is a wonderful example of community service and is an inspiration to many across the state of Missouri.

Better Life in Recovery has a mission that is twofold. Firstly, to foster dignity for those who struggle with substance abuse and mental health issues through performing community service. Secondly, the organization seeks to generate more public awareness of the dangers of substance abuse, through the medium of educational presentations, media interviews and public safety announcements.

On September 16 of this year the organization will be hosting a fundraising race to benefit recovery programs. It will begin at Rutledge Wilson Farm in Springfield. The fact that the race is held in September is also very pertinent with regards to the Better Life in Recovery's mission as it is held during National Recovery Month. National Recovery Month runs through the month of September. The purpose of National Recovery Month is to raise awareness and understanding of the various mental and substance use disorders some of our fellow Americans suffer from. It is also a month to celebrate those who have recovered from their addictions.

Mr. Speaker, Better Life in Recovery is an inspirational organization that I am humbled to recognize today. I would like to extend my personal congratulations and admiration on their achievements and hard work over the years. On behalf of the 7th District of Missouri, I wish this great organization the best of luck in all of their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VAL BUTLER DEMINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, my return to Washington this week was delayed by the impacts of Hurricane Irma.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 485, NAY on Roll Call No. 486, and NAY on Roll Call No. 487.

INTRODUCTION TO ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution I am introducing today expresses the sense of Congress that it and the states should consider a constitutional amendment to reform the Electoral College and to establish a process for electing the President and Vice President by a national popular vote. The resolution also encourages the states to further their efforts to form an interstate compact to award their Electoral College votes to the national popular vote winner.

This Sunday, September 17 is Constitution Day, marks the 230th anniversary of the Philadelphia Convention's approval of the Constitution. We should rightly celebrate the day that the Framers endorsed the basic framework of our democratic system of government enshrined in our Nation's governing charter. Yet, we should also use this day as an opportunity to reflect on the fact that the Constitution still retains the Electoral College, a fundamentally

anti-democratic process for electing our Nation's highest federal officeholders.

On five occasions in our history, the Electoral College has permitted the national popular vote winner to lose the presidential election, including the most recent election, where Hillary Clinton won nearly 3 million more votes than Electoral College winner Donald Trump. This occurs because a presidential candidate needs only 270 electoral votes and 48 states award their electoral votes on a ''winner-take-all'' basis. As a result, the Electoral College creates perverse incentives for candidates that further distort the presidential campaign process in undemocratic ways.

For example, the Electoral College encourages candidates to focus their campaign efforts on only a handful of so-called swing states. During the last presidential campaign, for example, both major party candidates largely bypassed three of the four states with the largest populations and skipped campaigning in 12 of the 13 smallest states as well.

Additionally, the Electoral College is an anachronistic institution intended, in part, to protect the institution of slavery. According to Yale Law School Professor Akhil Reed Amar, who participated in a forum on Electoral College reform sponsored by House Judiciary Committee Democrats last year, the Electoral College was established, in part, to preserve the political influence of slaveholding states. Although enslaved populations were not allowed to vote, slave states insisted that three-fifths of enslaved persons be counted when determining a state's representation in the House, which in turn affected the number of Electoral College votes allotted to the state.

Given its history and undemocratic nature, it is clear that the Electoral College system must be replaced with a process that determines the election of the president and vice president by a national popular vote. As such, Congress and the States should consider a constitutional amendment to reform the Electoral College.

And, Congress should also encourage the States to reform the Electoral College through the formation of an interstate compact. Eleven states representing 165 electoral votes have already entered into an interstate compact to cast their electoral votes for the national popular vote winner. When enough states—representing 270 electoral votes—join the compact, the presidential election will essentially be determined by national popular vote, obviating the need for a constitutional amendment.

In a democracy, no person's vote should be worth more than any other person's vote. Congress should affirm its commitment to this essential principle and definitively declare that the American people, not state-based Electors, should have the power to directly select the President and Vice President of the United States.

HONORING REV. DR. AMOS BROWN AND JANE BROWN

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Reverend Dr. Amos Brown and Jane Brown, as they celebrate 40 years of service at the historic Third Baptist Church of San Francisco.

Born on February 20, 1941 in Jackson, Mississippi, Rev. Brown became a fighter for civil rights and social justice at an early age after being influenced by Emmitt Till's murder and other examples of injustice in the Jim Crow South.

As a student leader attending Jim Hill High School, he spoke out about segregation in public education, and was barred from serving as valedictorian despite being elected to that position by his schoolmates.

His social activism led him to Morehouse College, where he was personally selected by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to enroll in the only class that Dr. King taught during his life. After graduating from Morehouse, Rev. Brown dedicated himself to the ministry and received his Masters of Divinity from Crozer Theological Seminary, and his Doctor of Ministry from the United Theological Seminary.

In 1976, Rev. Brown and his wife Jane moved west when he accepted a position as the senior pastor of Third Baptist Church of San Francisco. In that position he was able to combine his passion for tending to the spiritual well-being of the community with his desire to promote social and community activism to address the causes of injustice throughout society.

Under his guidance, Third Baptist has established itself as a leader in addressing the physical needs of the community and built bridges to expand the reach of his congregation in helping those in need around the world.

Third Baptist has led relief efforts in Africa, including sponsoring refugees and helped enable 80 children from Tanzania to receive heart surgery in the United States.

Rev. Brown's social activism also led him to many leadership positions outside of the ministry. He has served as the President of the San Francisco NAACP, and on the board of the national NAACP organization. He has also held elected positions as a San Francisco Community College Trustee and a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

On a personal note, I have been honored to learn from and work alongside Rev. and Mrs. Brown. I am incredibly grateful for their support, and for the selfless example that they have set by living out the teachings of scripture in their everyday lives.

Today, on behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, I salute Reverend Dr. Amos Brown and Jane Brown for their 40 years of service to the greater Bay Area, and beyond. The East Bay joins in celebrating the leadership that you have shown, and I look forward to many more years of working with them and Third Baptist.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HARVEST CHURCH OF GOD

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the 100th Anniversary of Harvest Church of God in Anniston, Alabama.

In 1916, J.B. Ellis walked through Gadsden, Alabama, and started the Alabama City Church of God, then moved on to Jacksonville, Alabama, and founded the Jacksonville Church of God. In 1917, in Anniston, Alabama, he put up a tent in Zinn Park and started a revival meeting that resulted in church set in order as Anniston Church of God.

Today those humble beginnings have resulted in Harvest Church of God. The church has 1,750 members who worship in a $12 million sanctuary, ministering to all of Northeast Alabama through multiple ministries. The church has also been a global television ministry for 20 of the 100 years.

The present pastor, Bishop Jerry Irwin, was appointed Senior Pastor of the church in 1986 and has begun his 32nd year of serving in the position.

The 100 year celebration will take place at Harvest Church of God on September 17, 2017.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the 100th Anniversary of Harvest Church of God.

SUMMER 2017 TRIP TO POLAND, LITHUANIA, AND ISRAEL

HON. SCOTT TAYLOR

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD remarks on behalf of my constituent, Rabbi Dr. Israel Zoberman. Rabbi Zoberman is the Founding Rabbi of Congregation Beth Chaverim in Virginia Beach, Virginia. Born in Chu, Kazakhstan (USSR) in 1945, he is the son of Polish Holocaust Survivors.

''It was early Sunday morning and I was leaving the house on the way to preach at Eastern Shore Chapel Episcopal Church in Virginia Beach. I am, gratefully, this historic church's Honorary Senior Rabbi Scholar. Having visited Poland, Lithuania, and Israel earlier this summer, I was eager to share my unsettling and transforming experiences from the trip, experiences that still keep me up at night. My 97-year-old mom's call from Haifa, Israel, 6,000 miles away, alarmed me. My indomitable mom, a Holocaust survivor from the Ukraine, worriedly uttered, ''What's happening in Virginia?'' She was referring, of course, to the tragic events that unfolded in Charlottesville due to the neo-Nazi, white supremacist, and KKK (What an unholy alliance!) repulsive rally.

That truly anti-American, vile anti-Semitic rally resurrected history's worst images which led to untold pain and loss. My mom's keen conscience and life's trying legacy, prompted her to be deeply concerned about what transpires in America 2017. After all, she is a witness that hatred of the other, fueled by prejudice, bigotry and jealousy, can end up, as it did, in gas chambers and mass executions of millions. The presence of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in our nation's capital is a poignant statement and a timely warning that democracies, even our great one, are vulnerable institutions; that poisonous ideas and pernicious minds can undermine all that we so cherish.

Virginia and the entire United States are ''For Lovers'' and not haters! Had the blessings of our uniquely American interfaith relations existed back then in Europe the magnitude of the Holocaust would surely be diminished. It is high time to revisit our educational system to ensure our basic American values of democracy, diversity and decency that have made America a leader, are taught on all levels lest the American dream becomes a nightmare.

When I examined the Ayelet Tours' June 2017 advertised trip to Poland and Lithuania accompanied by Professor Natan Meir of Portland State University (what an added bonus to a pilgrimage of sacred witness!), I couldn't but notice that my father's hometown of Zamosc in southeastern Poland was on the itinerary. My first exposure to Poland was at age six months old in 1946 when my family of Polish Holocaust survivors returned home from Siberia and Kazakhstan (then USSR) where I was born. However, we left after only four months. Some 1500 Jews were murdered by Poles who begrudged our survival and eyed our properties.

I visited Poland in February 1992 for a packed three-day trip sponsored by the Chicago Board of Rabbis. I recall seeing the sign leading to Zamosc and my frustration of not going there. This time I was in Zamosc and I am still overtaken by breathing the same air generations of my ancestors breathed, loved and labored till the tragic onslaught of Nazi terror. Imagine my speechless elation at being in the restored Sephardic ''Renaissance Synagogue'' built in the early 17th century, the only such edifice in Poland, which officially opened on April 5, 2011 with Poland's President Bronislaw Komorowski in attendance as Honorary Patron.

After all, my great-grandma Dina Menzis Zoberman was a descendent of Spanish and Portuguese Jews whose industrial and communal leadership in Zamosc was immense. Dina and her husband Rabbi Yaakov Zoberman perished in the Belzec death camp along with other family members and many of Zamosc's 14,000 Jews. I led our 17-member group in the memorial kaddish prayer. Half a million entered this latest of the six major Nazi death camps to be cared for (the American Jewish Committee played a pivotal role) and only three survived at war's end with two of them murdered following testifying in court!

Poland was the world center of Jewish life before WWII. Less than half a million Polish Jews survived out of 3.5 million, about half of the Holocaust's six million victims. Warsaw, Poland's capital has been rebuilt from its ruins and is now a thriving international metropolis. Its new Museum of the History of Polish Jews is called The Polin Museum. Polin is the Hebrew word for Poland meaning ''here we sleep and stay.'' This state-of-the-art museum is promising testimony to the new Poland which is free from both Nazism and Communism, proudly acknowledging its 1,000 years of Jewish life which contributed so much to Poland. It is significantly located next to the imposing Warsaw Ghetto Monument. How moved I was that after emerging from the breathtaking museum tour, the large IDF (Israel Defense Forces) annual delegation of ''Witnesses in Uniform'' conducted a memorial ceremony at the monument. It is an educational attempt to bond Israelis with past heroism and sacrifice. The servicemen and women also assist in cemetery work. We welcomed Shabbat at the Progressive synagogue of Beit Warszawa and in the morning, we joined at the Orthodox Nozyk Synagogue, the only one that survived the war, and met there Poland's Chief Rabbi who is American, Rabbi Michael Schudrich. We encountered Israeli tourists who took the 3 1/2-hour flight from Tel-Aviv to Warsaw on attractive ''deals'' with also a shopping spree in mind. The Chopin piano recital by Anna Kubicz was an elegant touch of Polish culture.

A memorable visit to Lodz with its reminders of a great industrial past of Jewish input. The former large Litzmannstadt Ghetto, the last of Poland's to be liquidated and second in size only to the Warsaw Ghetto, is a stark reminder of a tragic end. Controversial Chaim Rumkowski was the head of the Judenrat, the Jewish Council appointed by the Germans. In Lublin, we were at the once renowned Chachmei Lublin Yeshiva and the touching Brama Grozdka-NN Theater in the old Jewish quarter which preserves the rich Jewish past by very dedicated Gentile Poles. I'm still haunted by the photo of a Lublin Jewish boy who resembles by own grandson Danny, and the grim struggle and fate of the Jewish children and their helpless parents in the ghettos and camps. At the Majdanek death camp, the first major one to be liberated by the Russians as part of the Allied Forces, I mentioned in Hebrew to a number of Israeli officers from the delegation that they arrived 70 plus years too late. They responded that there was then no State of Israel, ''that's the point'' I retorted. Of the 360,000 lost lives, there, 120,000 were Jewish.

I was enchanted in Krakow by the largest Market Square in Europe, Wawel Castle, the Jagiellonian University with its Institute of Jewish Studies, the Cathedral which was home to Pope John Paul II and more. In the medieval Jewish Quarter of Kaziemierz there are restaurants offering Jewish dishes and Klezmer music in Yiddish and Hebrew by Poles who capture the Jewish spirit. I was moved by hundreds of American Jewish youth who celebrated Jewish life, connecting to both a glorious and painful past as they continued to Israel's Jewish rebirth. Being in Oskar Schindler's life-saving factory turned museum was an important reminder of those Righteous Gentiles who heroically stood by us. The Krakow JCC established with the aid of Prince Charles of England is uplifting indeed, and the instructive Galicia Jewish Museum where Professor Edyta Gaworn, its academic advisor, addressed us. The city is host to the famous annual Jewish Culture Festival. Visiting vast Auschwitz-Birkenau (symbol of evil's essence) where the Nazi death machine claimed a million and one-half Jewish lives was an eerie experience of shock and numbness. How monstrously deceptive is the infamous welcoming sign, ''Arbeit Macht Frei'' (work makes you free).

We witnessed the sites of once vibrant small Jewish communities in Poland's pastoral countryside, and the creative and noble synagogues' restoration as Jewish museums and cultural centers thou sadly without Jews; Sejny's neo-Baroque synagogue is home to the Borderland Foundation dedicated to Poland's rich multi-cultural heritage that is Polish, Jewish, Lithuanian, Belaurussian and Russian; Tykocin's 17th century Baroque synagogue; picturesque Sandomierz with its cathedral depicting a medieval blood-libel painting of rabbis sacrificing a Christian baby for matza baking. However, following much Jewish protest there is a recently placed plaque testifying that the alleged never took place; Chmielnik with its uniquely renovated synagogue-museum, a bima encased in glass and memorabilia of a once flourishing community.

Captivating Vilnius (Vilna), Lithuania's capital, evokes memories of Jewish religious and cultural heights. We attended the burial place of the Vilna Gaon, delighted that one of our fellow travelers from New York had recently discovered he was a descendent of this great rabbi. We visited the former ghetto as well as the Ponar Forest where 70,000 Jews were murdered, and the site of the famous escape tunnel dug by Jews who were ordered to burn the exhumed bodies. The calm forest belies the indescribable slaughter that should have shaken heaven and earth. Faina Kukliansky, Chair of Lithuanian Jewish Communities addressed us. At the Genocide Museum (a former KGB prison) we were exposed to the bloody brutalities of the Soviets toward Lithuanians in general along with mass deportations to Siberia, all regarded by Lithuania as genocidal policy. Lakeside Trakai, the medieval capital of Lithuania, offered us a respite, and we were enlightened at the Karaite museum, learning how this sect escaped Nazi persecution.

We are grateful to The Foundation for the Preservation of Jewish Heritage in Poland for its remarkable initiatives and accomplishments! The observed signs of Jewish renewal are encouraging and heartwarming, but surely this amazing journey was bound to stir deep and mixed emotions.

I continued by myself to Israel and how rewarding it was to know that there is a welcoming Jewish state following unfathomable destruction! To top it all, the aircraft carrier USS H. W. Bush whose homeport is Norfolk arrived in Haifa, my hometown, with close to 6,000 sailors and pilots aboard following bombing ISIS targets. It was the first American carrier to arrive in Israel in 17 years, spending July 4th in Israel. It was greeted enthusiastically, reaffirming the special bond between the two democratic allies. I fondly recall being present when a Torah Scroll (democracy's foundation) originally from Germany was presented to this incredible vessel, symbol of American freedom's resolve.''

CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF CNA

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge CNA in Arlington, Virginia, which is celebrating its 75th Anniversary of work in the public interest. CNA operates both the Center for Naval Analyses, which is the Federally Funded Research and Development Center for the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Institute for Public Research, which works for a variety of federal agencies including FEMA, Health and Human Services, the Coast Guard, and FAA. CNA was founded in 1942 at the request of the U.S. Navy by civilian scientists who left their positions at prestigious universities to help address the problem of U-boats sinking U.S. ships. In CNA's rich history, CNA has:

Served the U.S. Navy with scientific analysis throughout World War II, leading Admiral Jerauld Wright to conclude: ''I believe that no group of comparable size contributed more to the successful conduct of our war effort.''

Served the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps continuously for 75 years. The nonprofit organization in its service for the Navy and Marine Corps specializes in operations, weapons systems, logistics, manpower, training, policy, planning, special operations, and cyber warfare.

Analysts who have accompanied U.S. troops in every war and major operation since World War II. CNA analyst Dr. Irving Shaknov made the supreme sacrifice in service of the nation when he was shot down during the Korean War while collecting data in a Marine

Corps fighter. He was posthumously awarded the Medal of Freedom.

Analysts who have been injured or rescued from the water in the course of their service to the armed forces.

Analysts who serve in war and peace as scientific advisors at the side of combat commanders on land, at sea, and in headquarters organizations like the Pentagon.

Been a ''go to'' source of independent and objective advice that Congress relies upon. CNA has supplied analysis in response to congressional mandates for reports on Sea Based Air Platforms, the capacity of the national airspace system, Top Officials National Counter-Terrorism Exercises, detention programs for foreign detainees, the Afghan National Security Forces, and U.S. counterterrorism against Al-Qaeda, among others.

Provided research leadership. In support of the Gates Commission, CNA was instrumental in laying the analytical foundations for ending the draft and creating the all-volunteer military.

Repeatedly demonstrated its independence and willingness to stand behind scientific analysis even when it has proven unpopular. Its work on success rate of Tomahawk cruise missiles in Operation Desert Storm and changes in Soviet naval strategy in the 1970s challenged conventional wisdom at the time.

Provided field analytical support in response to humanitarian disasters in its service to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Navy, and the Department of Health and Human Services. It has provided both real-time and after-action analysis for Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Rita, the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, the 2011 earthquake and tsunami in Japan, Hurricane Sandy, and now, Hurricanes Harvey and Irma.

I applaud CNA and its 75 years of public service, and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting organizations like CNA that are committed to objectivity and data-driven solutions to the nation's problems.

HONORING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF TOURO UNIVERSITY CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Touro University California upon the occasion of its 20th Anniversary of providing quality graduate and professional programs to its students.

In 1997, Touro University California was established in San Francisco, California as the Touro College of Osteopathic Medicine. Two years later, on May 27, 1999, the College relocated to Mare Island in Vallejo, California. Today, Touro owns twenty-three historic buildings and structures on forty-four acres on Mare Island. They have grown to more than 1,500 students enrolled in three fully accredited colleges: the College of Osteopathic Medicine, the College of Pharmacy and the College of Education and Health Sciences.

Touro University California's academics are student-centered and research oriented. The College of Osteopathic Medicine hosts ''Research Days'' where students and faculty can share their research with our community. The Public Health program is using a one million dollar grant to research HIV prevention in high-risk populations with the KHANA Research Center in Cambodia. US News and World Report has ranked Touro in the Top 10 for placing graduates into primary care residencies for six consecutive years.

Touro University California is dedicated to helping their students develop rewarding careers in community service. The business community in Solano County awarded Touro the Spirit of Solano Award for Community Service. In 2012, Touro partnered with Solano County Public Help, increasing access to three county clinics for more than 30,000 patients. In the past year, the student-run clinic, staffed by groups of Touro students and faculty, recorded 420 free patient visits and 1,300 volunteer hours at the clinic.

Mr. Speaker, for the past twenty years Touro University California has offered a quality education to their students and many hours of service to our community. I am proud to have such an institution operating on Mare Island. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

RECOGNIZING THE AMITY FIRE COMPANY

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the Amity Fire Company for serving Berks County, PA since 1961. These men and women work tirelessly to ensure the safety of the community to which they belong. Since extinguishing their first fire in 1963, the Amity Fire Company continues to help local citizens who find themselves in harm's way.

The Amity Fire Company held its first social event in 1964. They sought to provide an opportunity for citizens to kindle relationships with their first responders. Since then, the fire company has become a pillar of stability in the area. They serve as a model for how an engaged and proactive group of leaders can contribute to a community's safety and welfare. I commend the personnel of the Amity Fire Company for all their efforts and wish them another 56 years of success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on September 7, 2017 my vote on Roll Call 473 on Grijalva Amendment No. 18 to H.R. 3354 was recorded as Nay, but I intended to vote Aye.

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF DR. JAMES DURELL TUBERVILLE

HON. MIKE JOHNSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise today to recognize the life and dedicated service of one of the Lord's most humble servants, Dr. James Durell Tuberville. He made it his life's work to help others during difficult times, and he was a beacon of light and a towering figure in the life of countless many people, including my own family. His lasting influence on our community cannot be expressed enough. I am humbled to rise and pay tribute to his life, his resolved stewardship and unwavering commitment to the people of Northwest Louisiana.

James Durell Tuberville was born on October 25, 1958, in Shreveport, Louisiana and on Sunday, August 13, 2017, he left this world to be with our Lord. After graduating from Southwood High School in Shreveport, Dr. Tuberville continued his education at Grawood Christian School and Southwestern Assemblies of God College. He majored in pastoral ministry at Southwestern University and received a master of arts in counseling from Louisiana Tech University.

He did all things for the glory of God, and brought care and compassion to multitudes. Dr. Tuberville served his early ministry as a youth pastor in Luna and Natchitoches, Louisiana. He later served as pastor of Bethel Assembly of God in Shreveport for more than II years, before becoming counselor on the pastoral staff at Shreveport Community Church, and president of Personal Solutions, Inc. He selflessly aided those suffering through some of the largest disasters of our lifetime, including the horrific earthquake in Haiti, the Oklahoma City bombing and the great tragedy on September 11, 2001.

Known and loved by all, Dr. Tuberville also served selflessly as chaplain for the Caddo Parish Sherriff's Office, Caddo Fire District 3, and as National Chaplain of the firefighters' Brother's Keepers Motorcycle Club. It is difficult to imagine our community without the larger-than-life, always encouraging presence of Dr. Tuberville. His legacy and example are an enduring lesson for all of us. We are comforted to know he has been received by the Lord with that ultimate affirmation, ''Well done, good and faithful servant.''

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is a privilege to honor Dr. James Durell Tuberville and to celebrate a life exceptionally well lived. My wife, Kelly, and I extend our prayers and sincerest condolences to his wife and soulmate, Susan, and two sons, Joshua Durell and Dustin Bruce, to the entire Tuberville family and all those whose lives were changed by this giant of a man.

HONORING DR. KENNETH J. AHLER

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great Hoosier, Dr. Kenneth J. Ahler

who passed away September 12, 2017. Not only was he a constituent in my district, but he was a great leader in the community.

Dr. Ahler was born in Medaryville, Indiana in 1940 and has been a resident of Rensselaer for over 47 years. He was raised in Pulaski County where he graduated as valedictorian from Medaryville High School. He attended St. Joseph's College and graduated A.B. Magna Cum Laude in biology and valedictorian of his college class. He went on to attend Indiana University School of Medicine in Indianapolis and received his M.D. in 1966. After his internship and residency at St. Joseph Hospital in South Bend, Indiana, Dr. Ahler served in the United States Air Force Medical Corps. He was Chief of Out-Patient Services at Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota. He returned to Indiana and married Mary Margaret O'Donnell and was a founding member of the Clinic of Family Medicine in Rensselaer.

He was elected Jasper County Coroner in 1973 and served for two terms. Throughout his professional career he served on numerous medical organizations. He was a member of the St. Augustine Catholic Church in Rensselaer, the American Medical Association, a distinguished member of the Indiana Medical Association, the Jasper County Medical Society and more. He served the community further as a member of the Rensselaer Rotary Club, Executive Council member and President of the Sagamore Council Boy Scouts of America, Chairman of the Jasper County Development Foundation, a 4th Degree Knight of Columbus, and he was awarded a Sagamore of the Wabash in 2004.

Dr. Ahler and I had a shared love for St. Joseph's College. Although we served at different times, both of us served the college as members of the Board of Trustees. I frequently heard from alumni about his affection for the students there and how they were always first in his mind when making decisions as a Trustee. It is no surprise to me that he was a favorite of those students for his dedication to his alma mater and those affiliated with the college.

Dr. Ahler will join his beloved Mary Margaret in heaven, and leaves three children, thirteen grandchildren and one great-grandchild to carry on his legacy of service to Hoosiers. May Kenneth rest in peace, he will not be forgotten.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HONORABLE JANE F. GARVEY

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate The Honorable Jane F. Garvey on being the recipient of The 2017 L. Welch Pogue Award for Lifetime Achievement in Aviation. Over the course of her distinguished career, she has delivered decades of dedicated service in top leadership roles within both the public and private sectors.

Jane Garvey grew up in Western Massachusetts. She graduated from Mount Saint Mary College in New York and then went on to attain her master's degree from Mount Holyoke College, where I served on the Board of Trustees for many years. Jane notably served as the fourteenth Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) from 1997 to 2002. She was the first FAA Administrator to serve a full five-year term and also the first woman to lead the agency. She directed the FAA through the formidable events of September 11, 2001 with compassion, steady guidance, and assurance of mission. She also led the agency through Y2K preparation and implementation. Prior to this, Jane was Acting Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration. She has also previously served as director of Boston's Logan International Airport, as well as commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works. Currently, Jane is the North America Chairman of Meridiam, one of the largest investors of public-private partnerships in the U.S. She serves on several noteworthy boards, including the Bipartisan Policy Center and the United Airlines Supervisory Board. Jane also has the distinction of serving as Chairman of the FAA's Management Advisory Council and the U.S. Department of Commerce's Investment Advisory Council.

Throughout her career, Jane Garvey has been recognized many times for her outstanding leadership and public service. These awards include the National Air Transportation Association's Distinguished Service Award, National Award of Excellence for Public Leaders, Woman of the Year Award for Women in Transportation and Women in Politics, and the 2017 Eno Transportation Foundation Lifetime Achievement Award to name just a few. Furthermore, in 2003, she was honored as one of the 100 Heroes in Aviation History.

Mr. Speaker, Jane Garvey is known for her deliberate collaboration and ability to bring stakeholders together. She is a person of outstanding character and I would like to once again thank her not only for her exemplary leadership and service, but also for her continued dedication to educating and supporting young, inspired professionals in careers of aviation and transportation. I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

HONORING REV. DR. HAROLD MAYBERRY

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Dr. Harold R. Mayberry for his 50 years of ministry in the African Methodist Episcopal Church and leadership in the City of Oakland as Senior Pastor of First AME, Oakland.

Reverend Dr. Harold R. Mayberry was born in St. Louis, Missouri where he joined St. James African Methodist Church at the age of eleven. At the age of twelve, he confided in the church's Senior Pastor that he believed he was called to the ministry. After being ordained a deacon at Wayman Temple AME Church and graduating from Wilberforce University, Pastor Mayberry studied at the oldest African American Seminary in the United States—Payne Theological Seminary in Wilberforce, Ohio.

His first assignment, located in Wentzville, Missouri, was Grant Chapel AME. He later pastored in Richmond, California and Friendship AME in Clarksdale, Mississippi.

After being confronted with the gravity of southern racism in Greenville, Mississippi; Pastor Mayberry was assigned to Payne Memorial AME church in New Orleans, Louisiana and arrived with an understanding that he needed to be more than a pastoral leader. He believed he was called to become a guardian of the community. So, he chose to openly and vigorously address the social concerns within the City of New Orleans.

Pastor Mayberry developed a friendship with the City of New Orleans' Mayor, Mark Morial, who later appointed Rev. Mayberry to Chairperson of the Police Chief Search Committee; Chairperson of the Human Relations Committee; and Chairperson of All Congregations Together. Pastor Mayberry was later elected to serve as a member of the City of New Orleans School Board.

In the fall of 1996, Rev. Dr. Harold R. Mayberry was appointed Senior Pastor of First AME, Oakland. Four years later, Pastor Mayberry was elected as a delegate to the 2000 Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, California; and in 2004, was elected to chair one of the most powerful committees of the African Methodist Episcopal Committee and was re-elected 2008, 2008, 2012 and 2016.

Rev. Dr. Mayberry has also served the City of Oakland as Chairperson of the Community Policing Advisory Commission, Member and later Chairperson of the City Service Commission, Member of the Oakland Police Chief's Advisory Committee; and at my sponsorship, United States House of Representatives Guest Chaplain.

I was incredibly proud and honored to welcome Rev. Mayberry to the House of Representatives in 2003, where he delivered a very powerful prayer to open our session. Rev. Mayberry was the first pastor from my district to ever offer the opening prayer before a session of the House.

Today, on behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, I commend the service and leadership of Reverend Dr. Harold R. Mayberry. I offer my sincere gratitude to the reverend and the African Methodist Episcopal Church for their devoted service and social impact in our American cities.

HONORING MAURO G. DEPASQUALE

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Mauro G. DePasquale. Mauro is a gifted filmmaker, singer, writer, and composer who has put his creativity to work as the Executive Director of Worcester Cable Community Access TV, where he started as a volunteer in 1990. Mauro has been a driving force behind the success of Worcester Cable Community Access TV, where he has used his platform to encourage community involvement and educational programming. Mauro has produced over one thousand television shows, and hosted and produced music scores for many TV and documentary films. His work in television production has been recognized with a Pegasus TV award, a

TELLY award, and many other awards. Through WCCA, Mauro offers citizens of Worcester from all walks of life and opinions the chance to speak their mind and be heard.

Mauro's soft-spoken exterior gives way to lively piano and vocals when he performs with his popular musical combo Jazzed Up, which he started in 2012. For the past few years, Jazzed Up has performed at the Worcester Columbus Day Parade Grand Marshal Banquet. Jazzed Up has been nominated Best Jazz Act at the Worcester Music Awards 2012–2015, and in 2014, Worcester Living Magazine voted Jazzed Up Best Entertainment group in Central Massachusetts.

Mauro is proud of his Italian heritage. Like so many Americans, his family came to the United States in search of a better life. His own experiences—hearing of the oppression and prejudice faced by immigrants when they first arrived in the United States—have made Mauro a lifelong supporter of the underdog and a strong voice for community service in Worcester. Mauro has been a fierce advocate for preserving Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church. As President of the Mount Carmel Preservation Society, he has fought tirelessly to save the church, which has been an epicenter for the Italian-American community in Worcester for nearly ninety years.

But Mr. Speaker, I rise today not just to recognize Mauro's public service, but to congratulate him on a new honor—on October 8, 2017 Mauro will march down Shrewsbury Street as Grand Marshal of the 2017 Worcester Columbus Day Parade. I join with all the residents of Worcester in thanking Mauro for his service to our community, and congratulating him on his selection as Grand Marshal of the 2017 Worcester Columbus Day Parade.

COMMEMORATING THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PAUL HALL CENTER FOR MARITIME TRAINING AND EDUCATION

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Paul Hall Center for Maritime Training and Education, which is located in Maryland's Fifth Congressional District. It is one of the leading schools for merchant mariners in the United States and a major contributor to the development and maintenance of our nation's proud maritime traditions.

The Paul Hall Center, which was founded in 1967 by late Seafarers International Union President Paul Hall, runs the leading training program for unlicensed merchant mariners in the United States today. It offers more U.S. Coast Guard-approved training courses than any other school in the nation and has trained tens of thousands of mariners since its founding. The Paul Hall Center's apprenticeship program, which is registered with the U.S. Department of Labor, has been praised as one of the most effective apprenticeship programs in the country and was honored as an ''Innovator and Trailblazer'' by the Labor Department in 2012. Today, the Paul Hall Center provides students a world-class education, preparing new merchant mariners to take their places on vessels sailing in both foreign and U.S.-flag fleets.

It is critical that our country maintain a merchant marine capable of transporting a large share of the seagoing commerce of the United States. The Paul Hall Center's programs help ensure a sufficient number of well-trained, highly skilled merchant mariners to crew U.S.-flag vessels both for the privately owned merchant marine and for U.S. government-operated fleets.

To that end, I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the significant contributions that the Paul Hall Center for Maritime Training and Education has made to our economy, our homeland security, and our national defense through its support of the U.S. Merchant Marine. I hope they will also join me in congratulating the Paul Hall Center on reaching this fiftieth anniversary milestone. I'm proud to represent this wonderful institution in the United States Congress.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JIM WHELAN

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim Whelan, a friend, colleague, and accomplished public servant, who passed away Tuesday August 22nd at the age of 68 at his home in Atlantic City, NJ.

Jim was born in Philadelphia on November 8, 1948. His academic and athletic career is nothing short of extraordinary. Jim became a nationally ranked distance swimmer while pursuing a B.A. in English at Temple University, later leading to his induction into the Temple University Athletic Hall of Fame in 1995 and the International Swimming Hall of Fame in 1999. Always passionate about helping others, Jim went on to receive a Masters of Education at Temple University, taking a job as a teacher in the Atlantic City School District shortly thereafter.

This was only the beginning of Jim's lifelong dedication to public service in Atlantic City and New Jersey. In 1981, Jim was elected to his first seat in public office, as a member of the Atlantic City Council. In 1990, Jim was elected Mayor of Atlantic City in a landslide, a symbol of how beloved he had become in Atlantic City. Jim and I served together as Mayors in New Jersey for seven years.

Jim was an outstanding Mayor, fighting tirelessly to revitalize Atlantic City. His work will surely be remembered for generations to come as crucial to the growth and development of Atlantic City. Serving alongside him as a New Jersey Mayor was nothing short of an honor and a pleasure. An even greater pleasure still was his consistent friendship and support. Throughout our years of friendship, I knew I could always count on Jim as a confidant and for his measured, thoughtful perspective.

As a Mayor, Jim focused his support on not just Atlantic City, but on legislation addressing the needs of all New Jersey Mayors and their Municipalities through his active service in the New Jersey Conference of Mayors. Eventually, he served as President of the New Jersey Conference of Mayors from 2000 to 2001. This only speaks to Jim's consistent dedication to helping others in any way he can. His decade of outstanding service as Mayor led to Jim being recognized as the Mayor of the Year by the New Jersey Conference of Mayors in 2001.

After departing as Mayor of Atlantic City in 2001, Jim returned to teaching. Only four years later, he was elected to the State Assembly of New Jersey. Two years after that, he was elected to the New Jersey Senate. Jim brought the very same traits that made him such a wonderful Mayor to legislating on behalf of all of New Jersey. The New Jersey Conference of Mayors again recognized Jim in 2009 as Legislator of the Year.

After a life of service to Atlantic City and New Jersey, Jim's honesty, dedication, love for his constituency, and kindness will be missed dearly. Jim is survived by his wife, Kathy, and their son Richard. Jim Whelan's service and devotion to his wife Kathy and son Richard were remarkable in every way. He was truly an honorable man who made this place better. My sincerest condolences are with Kathy, Richard, Jim's entire family, his staff and colleagues during this trying time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Mr. Jim Whelan's colleagues, family and friends, all those whose lives he has touched, and me, in recognizing Mr. Jim Whelan's remarkable life of public service.

KENNETH SMITH

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Petty Officer Kenneth ''Kenny'' Aaron Smith of Cherry Hill, New Jersey for his service to our nation.

Petty Officer Smith was born in Jackson, Michigan in 1995 and moved to Chesapeake, Virginia at the age of 10. When he was a teenager, Petty Officer Smith moved to South Jersey with his father, a Petty Officer in the U.S. Navy Reserve. In 2013, he graduated from Cherry Hill High School–East, and followed in his father's and grandfather's footsteps to join the U.S. Navy. As a third generation sailor, Petty Officer Smith was in his fourth year of serving.

During his time in the Navy, Petty Officer Smith worked in radar technology and held the rank of Electronics Technician, 3rd class and was posthumously advanced to the rank of Electronics Technician 2nd Class. During his free time, he published science fiction writings through an online platform known as 'Wattpad.' These writings were well liked by fans of the website. As an avid gamer, he also aspired to eventually pursue a career as a video game developer.

Petty Officer Smith is remembered by those close to him as being adventurous, loyal and patriotic. During his time at sea, Petty Officer Smith's ship had been to Australia and Japan, and he was looking forward to traveling to more places throughout the world. Petty Officer Smith was also known for his dedication to human rights, a love for animals and the ability to leave a positive mark on those he was acquainted with.

Petty Officer Smith was a true American hero who sadly lost his life while serving in the United States Navy. His service and sacrifice

to our country will not be forgotten. Mr. Speaker, Petty Officer Kenneth Aaron Smith was a great American who exemplified the true meaning of patriotism. I ask you to join me in honoring the memory of this truly exceptional young man.

TRIBUTE TO RICH WELLS, VICE PRESIDENT AND SITE DIRECTOR OF MICHIGAN OPERATIONS FOR THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rich Wells, Vice President and Site Director of Michigan Operations for The Dow Chemical Company, in recognition of his service and his many contributions to the Great Lakes Bay Region as he begins the next step of his journey as the Vice President of Texas Operations.

An influential member of the community, Rich originally moved to Midland to work for Dow after he graduated from the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology. During his illustrious 34-year career, Rich has gone on to serve in several leadership roles within The Dow Chemical Company. Before his selection as the Vice President and Site Director of Michigan Operations, Rich served as the Vice President for Global Government Affairs and Public Policy.

During his tenure as Vice President and Site Director of Michigan Operations, Rich has benefitted the community in a variety of ways. He founded the Fast Start program, which has equipped in demand employees with the skills they need to be successful. He also has volunteered and advocated for local organizations serving those in need, chairing Midland County's United Way Campaign in 2016.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to recognize Rich Wells for his service to The Dow Chemical Company and his contributions to the Great Lakes Bay Region.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on September 13, 2017, I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call votes 486, 487, 488, 489, 492, 493, 497, 498, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, and 515. I would have voted NAY on Roll Call votes 490, 491, 494, 495, 496, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, and 514.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, I was unavoidably detained off the House floor and was not present for Roll Call 528, the vote on final passage of H.R. 3354. Had I been present, I would have voted "No." As our nation comes together to help those affected by Hurricanes Harvey and Irma, I am saddened that members of Congress were not given the opportunity to come together to provide all of the people of our country the support they need to meet the many challenges they face and to invest in their future. This eight bill spending package was considered under a restrictive process that severely limited the ability of members to influence the bill. I could not in good conscience vote for this bill because it is based on the devastating House Republican budget, meaning that it underfunds and makes significant cuts to many of my constituents' key priorities such as job training, education, fixing our crumbling infrastructure, economic development, Pell Grants, housing affordability, after-school programs, and law enforcement. It attacks women's health by cutting family planning and Teen Pregnancy Prevention Grants and defunding Planned Parenthood, and it includes many poison pill policy riders that will undermine the Affordable Care Act, undo many important Dodd-Frank Wall Street reforms, and prevent the EPA from keeping our air and water clean. As the Ranking Member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee, I find it inexplicable that as we work to recover from Hurricanes Harvey and Irma and see new storms on the horizon, the bill slashes funding for programs that build resilience and can be used for prevention and recovery and it weakens efforts to understand and address climate change, a driving factor of more frequent and severe storms. I repeatedly tried to shift funding in the bill for immigration enforcement activities to more pressing homeland security needs, but I was rebuffed on party line votes. Instead of this short-sighted bill that would be disastrous for all Americans, I call on Republicans to join Democrats to enact spending bills that grow the economy, create jobs, and truly keep our nation secure.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES GRANTS

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to state my excitement that Democrats and Republicans were able to come together to add two million dollars to the Historic Preservation Fund grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the FY18 appropriations bill passed on the House floor today.

Last year, Congress appropriated $4 million for grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities under the National Park Service Historic Preservation Fund. Unfortunately, this year President Trump's FY18 budget eliminated all funding for this program. I was glad to see that both Democrats and Republicans strongly disagreed with President Trump's misguided cut, and ultimately decided to increase the total funding of HBCU grants to $5 million for FY18.

My district, the 7th Congressional District of Alabama, is well-known as the Civil Rights District. The State of Alabama is also home to fifteen Historically Black Colleges and Universities, the most in the country. These important grants will provide assistance to repair and restore historic buildings on our HBCU campuses. Our HBCUs are rich with history that deserves to be preserved for future generations, and I can think of no better institution than our Nation's storytellers, the National Park Service, to do the job. Moreover, this funding will help revitalize our HBCU campuses, and help stimulate economic revitalization in their communities.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for working with me in the past, as well as Assistant Leader CLYBURN for offering an Amendment to increase HBCU Grant funding by $2 million. This is an important program for our HBCUs, and I will continue to work across the aisle to ensure that these funds are protected in the final FY18 budget.

HONORING BEN WILLIAMS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, jazz artist Ben Williams will be honored this year by the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation at the Jazz Forum and Concert during the 47th Annual Legislative Conference. Mr. Williams, an internationally renowned bassist and composer, will also perform his Protest Anthology at the concert, which will take place on Thursday, September 21, 2017, at the Walter E. Washington Convention Center, in Washington, D.C. Mr. Williams will receive the 2017 CBCF ALC Jazz Innovator Award for his highly creative and multi-faceted contributions to jazz and world culture.

I am very proud to have known this very talented artist for many years. I am also pleased to share the following details of his impressive career as they appear in his biography.

Ben's mother used to work in my Capitol Hill office. When she took Ben, an energetic and curious six-year-old, into the office on his school break, a watchful eye was in order. One afternoon, while rambling around my personal office, Ben discovered a huge object that instantly captured his imagination. The shiny upright bass was like nothing the kid had ever seen. He tapped on it. He popped a string. He climbed up on it. "What is this thing?" he wondered.

Twenty years later, Ben Williams is still surprised at that chance meeting.

"Its low frequency attracted me," Williams recalls, "the way the instrument felt when I touched it. Then later, just the feeling of playing a groove. When you play a bass the whole instrument vibrates. It almost feels like the spirit of another human being. It's like dancing with somebody and being in full contact with them. And the sound of the instrument appealed to me. It's warm and deep and it resonated with me."

On the eve of his first CD, State of Art, Ben Williams had become one of the most sought after bassists in the world, his resume a who's who of jazz wisdom: Wynton Marsalis, Herbie Hancock, Pat Metheny, Terence Blanchard, Christian McBride Big Band, Nicholas Payton,

Paquito D'Rivera, Cyrus Chestnut, Benny Golson, George Duke, Eric Reed, Dee Dee Bridgewater, Roy Hargrove, and Mulgrew Miller, to name a few. State of Art signaled Williams' emergence as a prominent voice in the greater jazz community.

Ben's warm, woody tone, flowing groove, melodic phrasing, and storytelling approach has found favor among not just musicians, but also a larger audience. A bandleader, musical educator, composer, and electric and acoustic bassist, Ben was the winner of the 2009 Thelonious Monk Institute International Jazz Competition, a prestigious and important award that has propelled many a promising career. Working with New York's finest jazz musicians even before graduating from Juilliard, Williams showcased his band, Sound Effect, at The Jazz Gallery in New York, receiving an enthusiastic New York Times review. Writer Nate Chinen stated, ''Williams took several long solos in his first set at The Jazz Gallery . . . and each one felt more like an entitlement than an indulgence.'' Williams has recorded and performed regularly as a member of bands led by saxophonist Marcus Strickland, pianist Jacky Terrasson, and vibraphonist Stefon Harris. He has led his own groups at Dizzy's Club Coca-Cola, Harlem Stage, Rubin Museum of Art, Tribeca PAC in New York City, and SPAC in Saratoga Springs, NY.

Growing up in a family of musicians, visual artists, and rappers, young Ben Williams didn't plan on being a bassist and band leader. He wanted to be a rock star. His heroes were Prince and Michael Jackson, not Duke Ellington and Charles Mingus. Once again, a chance meeting altered his future.

''I'd been playing piano by ear, but I wanted to play guitar,'' Williams recalls. ''My middle school offered a strings class where figured I could learn guitar. Then I got there and it was all violins and cellos—no guitars. So I choose the coolest instrument I saw, the bass. It just looked right.''

Williams was a natural. He excelled on both bass and piano, and once enrolled at the Duke Ellington High School of the Arts, he became a star student, performing in jazz band, gospel choir, and orchestra, as well as extracurricular gigs. Williams graduated with honors and with a Best in Instrumental Music Award. He won scholarships from the Fish Middleton Scholarship Competition of the East Coast Jazz Festival, the International Society of Bassist's Competition, the Steans Music Institute, the Duke Ellington Jazz Society, the International Association for Jazz Education (IAJE), and the DC Public Schools City-Wide Annual Piano Competition. Williams received his Bachelor's in Music Education at Michigan State University in 2007, and his Master's in Music from the Juilliard School in 2009.

''In high school I dedicated myself to the bass and to jazz,'' Williams says. ''I knew this could be a profession, and if I could do what I love for a living—man, what is better than that? You always feel like a student playing jazz, there is so much to learn. There's never a point where you think you've arrived. I am trying to get better every day. Even Roy Haynes, when you see him play you get a sense that he is still trying to find new things.''

Like many self-aware jazz musicians, Ben Williams has several influences, from ''Wayne Shorter, Stevie Wonder and Duke Ellington'' to ''hip-hop and gospel, Little Dragon, Billy Joel, Marvin Gaye.'' And like his colleagues in the new guard of jazz, Williams is constantly looking ahead, seeking the music's potential and his place in it.

''I've worked with Stefon Harris' Blackout for the past few years,'' Williams cites. ''He has definitely been a huge influence in my concept of playing music. We have a similar viewpoint to music and jazz. He's very much about addressing modern times and not rehashing old material. To really interpret what is happening right now, a lot of jazz musicians are into hip-hop and R&B, but they don't put that into their music. We keep up with the times and we're not afraid to put that into our music.''

To other musician's music Williams brings his great natural skill and determination to explore, to expand boundaries while sustaining tradition. State of Art is a mature statement stamped with his voice, the next step in Ben Williams' evolution.

''I wanted to make an album that regular nine-to-five people could enjoy,'' Williams says; ''and to make a deep artistic statement as well. I like music that grooves, and I make sure that my music feels good.''

''I always bring a certain energy to whatever the musical situation is,'' the soft-spoken musician adds. ''I try to be a team player and be supportive, but also, I try to add my voice to the situation. It's a fine balance between putting your stamp on things and being supportive. I've found that balance pretty well.

''The diversity of my musical upbringing has allowed me to be comfortable in many different musical situations. I don't try to sound like anyone else, I just try to be honest musically and bring a youthful spirit.''

Mr. Speaker, Ben Williams is an accomplished young artist and band leader that has made a lasting impression on jazz as an art and as a field. Ben Williams has become a national jazz treasure of international acclaim, and I urge all Members to join me in commending him for his magnificent contributions.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MERIDEN YMCA

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the 150th Anniversary of the YMCA in Meriden, Connecticut. For the past century and a half, this community institution and its dedicated leaders have brought together our neighbors to help those in need and create a shared space for our town to learn, play, and healthy lives.

Today, the Meriden YMCA is one of the most active organizations in the City of Meriden. It sponsors community events, for important causes from promoting physical fitness to raising awareness about issues affecting Meriden. The YMCA also brings together seniors in our community to offer them resources to lead active lives and share community space.

The YMCA is critical to helping and educating children in Meriden. It offers them a safe place to be active, learn, and form friendships, often with opportunities such as summer camps or trips in New England that broaden children's educational experience.

Mr. Speaker, the Meriden YMCA has been serving our community and addressing the needs of some of our most vulnerable neighbors for a century and a half. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor the Meriden YMCA, and all the community leaders who have contributed to its success, here today.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATED SERVICE AND OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL JOANNE SHERIDAN

HON. MIKE JOHNSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a member from my home state, Major General Joanne Sheridan, for her steadfast service to the safety and security of the people of Louisiana in the Louisiana National Guard. Five years ago, Major General Sheridan became the first female general in the Louisiana National Guard, and today, I would like to commend her for raising the bar again and becoming the first female Two-Star General in the Louisiana National Guard.

Originally from Maine, Major General Sheridan moved to Leesville, La., when the Army stationed her father, Command Sergeant Major Joe S. Fernald, at Fort Polk. There, she attended Leesville High School and went on to earn her Bachelor of Arts Degree in sociology at Northeast Louisiana University in Monroe, La., where she received her commission through Reserve Officer Training Corps in May 1983. Later, she received a master's degree in strategic studies from the prestigious U.S. Army War College.

A true solider to her community and country, Major General Sheridan began her impressive military career as an active duty service member in the U.S. Army in February 1984, at Fort Polk Army Base. Throughout her 33-year career, in both her active duty and National Guard service, her leadership has earned her the respect of her peers and included many major accomplishments. She became the first female to command a battalion leading the 41th Military Intelligence Battalion, Commander of the 199th Regiment Regional Training Institute, and the first female to helm a major command when she led the 61st Troop Command. Currently, she serves as the Assistant General for the Louisiana National Guard and is responsible as the principal military advisor to the Adjunct General in assisting in the deployment and coordination of programs, policies and plans for the Louisiana Army and Air National Guard.

The National Guard is unique in defending Louisiana both at home and abroad. Major General Sheridan served as a citizen soldier through Hurricane Katrina, was deployed to Baghdad in support of Operation Iraq Freedom in 2008, and led rescue and recovery efforts in the historic Louisiana flooding of 2016. She previously served as president of the National Guard Association of Louisiana and now serves as secretary of the National Guard Association of the U.S. Her dedication to the National Guard extends past what is required. Twice, Major General Sheridan has battled breast cancer and with her last round of treatment in August, has again won the battle. Her incredible strength and courage serve as a beacon of hope for others.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to honor Major General Sheridan's many accomplishments and to recognize her honorable service to the state of Louisiana and our great nation. She has set a tremendous example, and I hope her accomplishments inspire others to exemplify her excellence. My wife, Kelly, and I thank Major General Sheridan for all she does to defend our community and country, and we wish her continued success.

HONORING MS. BOBBE NORRISE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the vibrant life of Bobbe Norrise, the first African-American yoga instructor in the San Francisco Bay Area, who shared her passion with our community for over four decades and passed away on May 24, 2017.

Ms. Norrise was born in Berkeley, California, and graduated from Berkeley High School before she received her Bachelor and Master's Degrees from San Francisco State University.

In 1970, while challenged by the hardships of being a new mother going through a divorce, Ms. Norrise took her first yoga class at Oakland's Studio One which she credited with easing her stress and changing her life. Six years later, Ms. Norrise earned certification from America Yoga College to be an Iyengar Yoga Instructor, thus becoming the first African-American yoga teacher in the Bay Area.

Initially, Ms. Norrise taught her classes in a church on Oakland, California's Webster Street, pioneering a welcoming space for African-Americans in the yoga community. She later became a professor in the Department of Kinesiology at San Francisco State University and dedicated over 20 years to teaching Hatha Yoga in the Bay Area.

In the mid-1970s, Ms. Norrise and her husband began hosting retreats to assist others on their spiritual journeys. In the 1990s, Ms. Norrise began hosting retreats for women with her daughter, Stacey Harmon.

In 1990, Ms. Norrise published ''Easy Yoga for Busy People'', thus becoming the first African-American yoga instructor to write and publish a book about yoga.

Many Bay Area media outlets have featured Ms. Norrise. Stories about her influence in the Bay Area have been documented by KRON-Channel 4, KQED radio and television, Mercury News, and the Oakland Tribune and features about her impact on the yoga community have been published in the Yoga Journal and Heart & Soul Magazine.

In 2011, then-mayor of Oakland, Jean Quan, declared May 15th to be ''Bobbe Norrise Day'' to acknowledge Ms. Norrise for all of her accomplishments in the field of Yoga instruction and advocacy.

Today, on behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, it is my honor to commend the life and achievements of Ms. Bobbe Norrise. I offer my sincere gratitude to Ms. Norrise for her dedication to spreading self-discovery and tranquility throughout the Bay Area and yoga communities. I also offer my condolences to Ms. Norrise's family and friends as they cope with this immeasurable loss and join together to celebrate her life.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5709–S5773

Measures Introduced: Eighteen bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1805–1822, and S. Res. 255–259. **Pages S5742–43**

Measures Reported:

S. 1088, to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 115–156)

S. 1103, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department-wide guidance and to develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign. (S. Rept. No. 115–157) **Page S5742**

Measures Passed:

National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act: Senate passed S. 129, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S5770–71**

McConnell (for Wicker) Amendment No. 1091, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S5770–71**

Jobs for Our Heroes Act: Senate passed S. 1393, to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses. **Page S5771**

No Human Trafficking on Our Roads Act: Senate passed S. 1532, to disqualify from operating a commercial motor vehicle for life an individual who uses a commercial motor vehicle in committing a felony involving human trafficking. **Page S5771**

Combating Human Trafficking in Commercial Vehicles Act: Senate passed S. 1536, to designate a human trafficking prevention coordinator and to expand the scope of activities authorized under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's outreach and education program to include human trafficking prevention activities, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S5771–72**

Hispanic Heritage Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 256, recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States. **Pages S5746–47**

Isaac M. Wise Temple Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 257, designating September 16, 2017, as "Isaac M. Wise Temple Day". **Page S5747**

National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 258, designating the week beginning September 10, 2017, as "National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week". **Pages S5747–48**

National Family Service Learning Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 259, expressing support for the designation of the week of September 11 through September 15, 2017, as "National Family Service Learning Week". **Pages S5748–49**

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5712–27, S5731–38**

Pending:

McCain/Reed Modified Amendment No. 1003, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S5712–27**

McConnell (for McCain) Amendment No. 545 (to Amendment No. 1003), of a perfecting nature. **Pages S5712–27**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 84 yeas to 9 nays (Vote No. 197), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on McCain/Reed Modified Amendment No. 1003 (listed above). **Page S5732**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing, notwithstanding Rule XXII, that at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, September 18, 2017, McConnell

(for McCain) Amendment No. 545 (to Amendment No. 1003) (listed above) be withdrawn, Senate adopt McCain/Reed Modified Amendment No. 1003 (listed above), and Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill; and that if cloture is invoked, all post-cloture time be considered expired and Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended. **Page S5738**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, September 18, 2017, Senate resume consideration of the bill as under the previous order. **Page S5772**

Francisco Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Noel J. Francisco, of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States. **Pages S5727–31**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of H.R. 2810, National Defense Authorization Act. **Page S5727**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S5727**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 80 yeas to 17 nays (Vote No. EX. 196), Pamela Hughes Patenaude, of New Hampshire, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. **Pages S5727–31**

D. Michael Dunavant, of Tennessee, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Tennessee for the term of four years.

Louis V. Franklin, Sr., of Alabama, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Alabama for the term of four years.

Jessie K. Liu, of Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the District of Columbia for the term of four years.

Richard W. Moore, of Alabama, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Alabama for the term of four years.

Daniel J. Kaniewski, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Administrator for National Preparedness, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

Kurt G. Alme, of Montana, to be United States Attorney for the District of Montana for the term of four years.

Donald Q. Cochran, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Tennessee for the term of four years.

Russell M. Coleman, of Kentucky, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Peter E. Deegan, Jr., of Iowa, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Iowa for the term of four years.

Marc Krickbaum, of Iowa, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Iowa for the term of four years.

Brian J. Kuester, of Oklahoma, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for the term of four years.

R. Trent Shores, of Oklahoma, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Oklahoma for the term of four years.

Bart M. Davis, of Idaho, to be United States Attorney for the District of Idaho for the term of four years. **Pages S5738, S5772**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Glen R. Smith, of Iowa, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring May 21, 2022.

Brian D. Montgomery, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Walter G. Copan, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology.

Matthew G. T. Martin, of North Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of North Carolina for the term of four years.

Michael B. Stuart, of West Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia for the term of four years.

James E. Trainor III, of Texas, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2023. **Page S5772**

Nomination Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nomination:

Daniel Alan Craig, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, which was sent to the Senate on July 25, 2017. **Page S5773**

Messages from the House: **Page S5742**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S5742**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S5742**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5743–46**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5746–49**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5741–42**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S5749–70**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S5770**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—197) **Pages S5731–32**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:03 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, September 18, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5772.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FARM BILL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine nutrition programs, focusing on perspectives for the 2018 Farm Bill, after receiving testimony from Brandon Lipps, Acting Deputy Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, and Gil Harden, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, and Ann M. Coffey, Assistant Inspector General of Investigations, both of the Office of the Inspector General, all of the Department of Agriculture; Sam Schaeffer, Center for Employment Opportunities, New York, New York; Bryan Parker, Community Food Bank of Eastern Oklahoma, Tulsa; Jimmy Wright, Wright's Market, Opelika, Alabama, on behalf of the National Grocers Association; Diane Whitmore Schanzenbach, Northwestern University Institute for Policy Research, Evanston, Illinois; and Brian Riendeau, Dare to Care Food Bank, Louisville, Kentucky.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, after receiving testimony from Clay Lowery, Rock Creek Global Advisors LLC, and Kevin J. Wolf, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer and Feld LLP, both of Arlington, Virginia; and James A. Lewis, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Alexandria, Virginia.

INDIVIDUAL TAX REFORM

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine individual tax reform, after receiving testimony from Lily L. Batchelder, New York University School of Law, New York; Alex M. Brill, and Ramesh Ponnuru, both of the American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C.; and Iona Harrison, Pioneer Realty, Upper Marlboro, Maryland, on behalf of the National Association of Realtors.

FCC LIFELINE PROGRAM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Federal Communications Commission's Lifeline Program, focusing on a case study of government waste and mismanagement, after receiving testimony from Seto Bagdoyan, Director, Forensic Audits and Investigative Service, Government Accountability Office; Ajit Pai, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; and Vickie S. Robinson, Universal Service Administrative Company, Washington, D.C.

INDIVIDUAL INSURANCE MARKET

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine stabilizing premiums and helping individuals in the individual insurance market for 2018, focusing on health care stakeholders, after receiving testimony from Raymond G. Farmer, South Carolina Department of Insurance Director, Columbia, on behalf of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; Manny K. Sethi, Healthy Tennessee, Nashville; Susan Turney, Marshfield Clinic Health System, Marshfield, Wisconsin; and Robert Ruiz-Moss, Anthem, Inc., and Christina Postolowski, Young Invincibles, both of Denver, Colorado.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Ralph R. Erickson, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, Donald C. Coggins, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, Dabney Langhorne Friedrich, of California, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, Stephen S. Schwartz, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Robert J. Higdon, Jr., to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina, J. Cody Hiland, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Joshua J. Minkler, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Indiana, and Byung J. Pak, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 30 public bills, H.R. 3771–3800; 1 private bill, H.R. 3801; and 10 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 79; and H. Res. 520–528, were introduced. **Pages H7421–23**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H7424–25**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 479, resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Treasury to provide to the House of Representatives the tax return information of President Donald J. Trump as well as the tax returns of each business entity disclosed by Donald J. Trump on his Office of Government Ethics Form 278e (H. Rept. 115–309); adversely;

Committee on Ethics. In the matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Luis V. Gutierrez (H. Rept. 115–310);

H.R. 2374, to facilitate certain pinyon-juniper related projects in Lincoln County, Nevada, to modify the boundaries of certain wilderness areas in the State of Nevada, and to fully implement the White Pine County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act (H. Rept. 115–311);

H.R. 2423, to implement certain measures relating to management of Washington County, Utah, required by Public Law 111–11 (H. Rept. 115–312);

H.R. 2763, to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and Small Business Technology Transfer program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–313, Part 1); and

H.R. 2763, to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and Small Business Technology Transfer program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–313, Part 2). **Page H7421**

Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act: The House passed H.R. 3697, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 175 nays, Roll No. 517. **Pages H7387–H7401**

Rejected the Beyer motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 184 yeas to 220 nays, Roll No. 516. **Pages H7399–H7401**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment printed in H. Rept. 115–307 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. **Page H7387**

H. Res. 513, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3697) was agreed to yesterday, September 13th.

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018: The House passed H.R. 3354, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, by a yea-and-nay vote of 211 yeas to 198 nays, Roll No. 528. **Pages H7402–11**

Rejected the Jackson Lee motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 527. **Pages H7408–10**

Agreed to:

Palmer amendment (No. 192 printed in H. Rept. 115–297) that was debated on September 13th that prohibits funds from being used to implement the District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act (by a recorded vote of 214 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 518); **Page H7402**

Huizenga amendment (No. 207 printed in H. Rept. 115–297) that was debated on September 13th that prohibits the use of funds to implement, administer, or enforce a SEC rule pursuant to Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act relating to conflict minerals (by a recorded vote of 211 ayes to 195 noes, Roll No. 525); and **Pages H7406–07**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 223 printed in H. Rept. 115–297) that was debated on September 13th that provides additional funding to the Taxpayer Advocate Service for the purpose of assisting the parents of a deceased child, when that child's information has been stolen and used on personal income taxes filed with the IRS, when the parent or guardian of record must report the identity theft of their deceased child's information (by a recorded vote of 265 ayes to 143 noes, Roll No. 526). **Pages H7407–09**

Rejected:

Gohmert amendment (No. 195 printed in H. Rept. 115–297) that was debated on September 13th that sought to reduce the Internal Revenue Service's Operations Support account by $165,300.00 and transfer that amount to the Spending Reduction account (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 519); **Pages H7402–03**

Norton amendment (No. 196 printed in H. Rept. 115–297) that was debated on September 13th that sought to strike the repeal of the District of Columbia's Local Budget Autonomy Amendment Act of 2012 (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 222 noes, Roll No. 520); **Pages H7403–04**

Ellison amendment (No. 199 printed in H. Rept. 115–297) that was debated on September 13th that sought to strike section 926 on page 590, relating to bringing the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau into the regular appropriations process (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 226 noes, Roll No. 521); **Pages H7404–05**

Ellison amendment (No. 200 printed in H. Rept. 115–297) that was debated on September 13th that sought to strike section 915 on page 563, relating to manufactured housing (by a recorded vote of 163 ayes to 245 noes, Roll No. 522); **Pages H7404–05**

Ellison amendment (No. 201 printed in H. Rept. 115–297) that was debated on September 13th that sought to strike section 928, relating to removal of authority to regulate small-dollar credit (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 221 noes, Roll No. 523); and **Pages H7405–06**

Mitchell amendment (No. 204 printed in H. Rept. 115–297) that was debated on September 13th that sought to reduce by 10% general administrative and departmental salary and expense accounts in Division D, and transfers the savings to the Spending Reduction Account (by a recorded vote of 166 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 524). **Page H7406**

H. Res. 504, the rule providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) was agreed to Thursday, September 7th.

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Tuesday, September 12th:

Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act of 2017: H.R. 3284, amended, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 398 yeas to 4 nays, Roll No. 529. **Pages H7411–12**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, September 18th and that the order of the House of January 3, 2017, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day. **Page H7412**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and ten recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7400–01, H7401, H7402, H7402–03, H7403–04, H7404, H7405, H7405–06, H7406, H7406–07, H7407–08, H7410, H7410–11, H7411–12. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

Committee Meetings

POWERING AMERICA: DEFINING RELIABILITY IN A TRANSFORMING ELECTRICITY INDUSTRY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Powering America: Defining Reliability in a Transforming Electricity Industry". Testimony was heard from Neil Chatterjee, Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Patricia Hoffman, Acting Under Secretary for Science, Acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Electricity, Department of Energy; and a public witness.

SUPPORTING TOMORROW'S HEALTH PROVIDERS: EXAMINING WORKFORCE PROGRAMS UNDER THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Supporting Tomorrow's Health Providers: Examining Workforce Programs Under the Public Health Service Act". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TECH TALKS: HOW SBA ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS HAVE EVOLVED WITH TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Health and Technology held a hearing entitled "Tech Talks: How SBA Entrepreneurial Development Programs Have Evolved with Technology". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

RUSSIAN DISINFORMATION

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine the scourge of Russian disinformation, after receiving testimony from John F. Lansing, Broadcasting Board of Governors, Melissa Hooper, Human Rights First, and Molly McKew, Fianna Strategies, all of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, September 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2810, National Defense Authorization Act, with votes on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill, and on passage of the bill at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, September 18

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 2 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bacon, Don, Nebr., E1226
Beyer, Donald S., Jr., Va., E1230
Blunt Rochester, Lisa, Del., E1223
Boyle, Brendan F., Pa., E1231
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1227
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1222
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1225, E1228, E1234
Demings, Val Butler, Fla., E1228
Esty, Elizabeth H., Conn., E1227, E1235
Gottheimer, Josh, N.J., E1221
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1234
Harper, Gregg, Miss., E1228
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E1233
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1227
Johnson, Mike, La., E1231, E1235
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1221
Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E1222
Krishnamoorthi, Ill., E1221
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1226, E1229, E1232, E1236
Long, Billy, Mo., E1228
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1232
Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E1231
Moolenaar, John R., Mich., E1234
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E1232
Nolan, Richard M., Minn., E1224
Norcross, Donald, N.J., E1233
Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E1222
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E1233
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1229
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E1231
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E1234
Schneider, Bradley Scott, Ill., E1224
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1226, E1234
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1223
Taylor, Scott, Va., E1229
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1231
Tsongas, Niki, Mass., E1224
Welch, Peter, Vt., E1224
Williams, Roger, Tex., E1221
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E1223

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.