House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, April 17, 2018.
I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB BISHOP to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.
PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

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

ALLEGIANT AIR
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.
Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, the CBS News program “60 Minutes” documented incident after incident—more than 100 in a less than 2 years—of aborted takeoffs, unscheduled landings, smoke-filled cabins, cabin-pressure loss, and other emergency situations.

A former prosecutor at the FAA with 30 years of experience says: “You know, if, God forbid, there is an accident, I think there will be a lot of people saying, ‘Well, we knew. We knew and we did nothing.’”

Mr. Speaker, Allegiant Air is a tragedy waiting to happen. And they really should know better, and we as a country should know better, because the CEO of Allegiant is none other than one of the founders of ValuJet.

Do you remember them? They were the cut-rate airline that was apparently cutting corners on safety to boost their position with stockholders. But they aren’t flying anymore because ValuJet flight 592, with 110 people on board, plunged into the Everglades after taking off from Miami International Airport 22 years ago.

What we learned after the fact was that the airline drove up profits, pushed its fleet to the edge, took extra freight in cargo holds to make extra money, and cut corners on the safety of its passengers. And you know what happened. People died.

We have seen this before, which leads to the very important question for Congress: Why isn’t anyone doing anything about it? Where is the FAA? Where is the DOT and the committees of jurisdiction here in the House of Representatives? I hear the Senators are doing something about it.

Why have there been no hearings and so little response from the Federal Government? “60 Minutes” made a compelling case that the regulators are not doing their jobs. Host Steve Kroft said: “Over the last 3 years, the FAA has switched its priorities from actively enforcing safety rules with fines, warning letters, and sanctions, which become part of the public record”—so we would all know about the safety of these airlines—“to working quietly with the airlines behind the scenes to fix the problems”—yes, at the backs of the American people that they are supposed to protect.

This airline, Allegiant, with 3.5 times many serious emergency incidents as any other airline, might be a special case or it might just be typical, but we just don’t know. And the American people just don’t know.

If the FAA isn’t doing a good job of making sure Allegiant Air is safe, what else are we missing about the airlines? We ought to demand that the experts inside and outside of Congress get the facts and all the people are accountable.

Now, I understand that the dirtiest word in the conservative dictionary is “regulation,” and, frankly, it is not clear that the downside in regulatory oversight happened exclusively or even more rapidly since our current businessman and TV host President took office; but I think it is clear that following the rules being transparent and being accountable in American industry, especially the airline industry where millions of lives are at stake every day, ought to be a top priority.

When I sit down to dinner with my family, I want to know the chicken and vegetables on my plate are safe to eat.
My car, my gadgets, and my flight home all deserve rigorous scrutiny. I want to know that the water my grandson drinks is clean.

The American people are losing confidence, Mr. Speaker, that the people who are supposed to be watching out for us are actually watching over us when we eat, drink, breathe, travel.

There is a big drive in Congress to cut government budgets, cut red tape, crusade against regulation. The other side romanticizes regulation almost as much as the President demonizes immigration. But I just want to make sure that, when the Federal Government and this Congress are cutting budgets, we are not cutting corners that allow airplanes with Americans on them, with anybody on them, with human beings on them, to fly out of the sky so that companies can make better profits.

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

CONGRATULATING UM-NSU CARD ON 25TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to recognize the 25th anniversary of the University of Miami-Nova Southeastern University Center for Autism and Related Disabilities, known as UM-NSU CARD.

On April 28, friends, families, health advocates, and community leaders from throughout our area in south Florida will gather together to celebrate this notable milestone at the Tropical Nights Gala on beautiful Biscayne Bay.

Since 1993, the outstanding staff and professionals at CARD have excelled at providing specialized services to individuals living with autism and related disabilities. By working with a network of outreach centers, UM-NSU CARD is able to create lasting opportunities and growth for so many.

Currently, CARD assists over 11,000 families in our south Florida community, offering them invaluable support, resources, and guidance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate all of the staff, the volunteers, the advocates, and the family members who get so much out of the University of Miami-Nova Southeastern Center for Autism and Related Disabilities on this proud 25th anniversary. I thank them all for helping those with autism, related disabilities, and spectrum disorders to achieve their full potential and leave their own beautiful mark on our beautiful world.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI SPORTS HALL OF FAME

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate all of the organizers and supporters of the University of Miami Sports Hall of Fame Banquet. This wonderful event will take place this Thursday, and this year’s festivities will be extra special because we will be celebrating the 50th anniversary of the University of Miami Sports Hall of Fame.

I am proud University of Miami Hurricane where I earned my doctorate in education. I am married to Dexter, a fellow UM Cane. My stepson and daughter-in-law, Dougie and Lindsay, are graduates of University of Miami Law School, as is my stepdaughter-in-law, Katherine. So the Lehtinen clan, we are real boosters of the University of Miami Hurricanes, and we wish all the best to the guests and participants of the banquet.

Congratulations to the University of Miami for its Sports Hall of Fame 50th Anniversary.

Go Canes.

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on this day, as a lawyer and as a Congressman, I want to express my admiration for the Department of Justice, the FBI, Mr. Mueller, Mr. Rosenstein, Mr. Wray, and others.

The attorneys in the Justice Department are among the best in the country, and Mr. Mueller and Mr. Rosenstein are in that group. The FBI have the finest law enforcement people in our country, and Mr. Wray heads that office up.

Besides being outstanding jurists, men of probity and propriety, who else do Mr. Wray, Mr. Rosenstein, and Mr. Mueller have in common? They are all Republicans, and they have all been attacked by our President.

Our President said, when the warrant was issued on his attorney's office for his materials, that that was an attack on our country. In my opinion, that statement and the attacks on our Justice Department and FBI, and on Mr. Rosenstein and Mr. Mueller and Mr. Wray, those were attacks on our country.

When one undermines the Justice Department and the FBI and, basically, people working in the Federal Government to protect us and see that our laws are carried out in an appropriate manner, that the rule of law, which this country is respected for around all over the world, is meted out in evenhanded fashion, that is an attack on the fundamental principles of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I resent that suggestion. The fact is Mr. Rosenstein showed great bravery in seeing—as we say in jury charges, “going where truth dictated and justice demanded”—in seeing that that warrant was issued. They did it on the basis of probable cause and information that led to having surveillance of Mr. COHEN. They had to have probable cause to even have surveillance. And then to go through—knowing this man was the attorney for the President—and authorize the warrant and to know his job was on the line and his neck was on the line showed great courage, something we all in America should respect and hold up as an admirable quality in a man and exhibit the best characteristics of our citizenry.

Then Mr. Rosenstein, a learned attorney who didn’t feel that attorney-client privilege was being infringed upon, sent the case to the Southern District of New York, where other lawyers who were trained took the case to a judge, who was also learned in the law, who said the warrant should issue.

Attorney-client privilege is alive and is being dealt with in the proper fashion in Judge Wood’s courtroom. She is properly seeing to it that it is respected, but that information that is not that of an attorney-client privilege will be revealed to the American public.

For some reason, a lot of people today who normally are talking about the Second Amendment are talking about attorney-client privilege like it is the biggest legal principle in our country’s fabric. What is more important than anything—and attorney-client privilege is being respected—is the information that has been garnered through that search warrant that could show the possibility of crimes being committed by the President of the United States of America. There is nothing more important than that. Why people are concerned about that and not the information that they are trying to keep quiet astonishes me.

We need a transparent President. We need a President who pays his taxes and reveals them to the American public and who doesn’t try to squash the Justice Department, the FBI, and means of people of probity and rectitude and character.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Rosenstein, Mr. Mueller, Mr. Wray, the Justice Department, and FBI officials.

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

FREE SPEECH FOR ME, BUT NOT FOR THEE?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Alexander Hamilton was 21 years of age; Andrew Jackson, 20 years of age; James Monroe, 18; James Madison, 20 years old. These young Founding Fathers, some of America’s most notable names, were college age when they stood against an opposing British monarch and demanded life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In fact, the right to freedom of speech was considered so important that James Madison, the author of the
Constitution, made it the First Amendment in the Bill of Rights. However, it seems today that some of America’s youngest minds of this generation have forgotten just what it is this great Nation stands for and what ideals it was built on.

A disturbing trend has begun cropping up on some college campuses around the country. The ideals that our Founding Fathers so painstakingly penned into law are at risk of disappearing from the sacred parchment of liberty. Freedom of speech is under attack. The left has perpetrated the idea that freedom of speech only applies to them but not to opposing views: free speech for me but not for thee.

Conservative thinkers are often banned from some universities. If they are invited, students are allowed the diatribe to the ever growing crowd.

Mr. Speaker, since when does a war of words include physical violence against anyone who disagrees? Some universities and students claim that if speech is offensive, it must be banned; and who are we to tell someone what is offensive or hurtful? The listener? The elite academia? The government?

This is a very dangerous philosophy that some of our universities are promoting and students are accepting. The British censored speech critical of the King. That is one reason the free flow of diverse ideas is protected in our country. The Bolsheviks and Lenin enforced censorship of ideas they opposed.

Lenin said, to paraphrase: We don’t let our enemies have guns. Why should we let them have ideas that are calculated to criticize the government?

Speech control by universities, professors, students, or government is a violation of the 1776 movement. It seems as if our very founding document is at risk of fading into the abyss of history.

Have we forgotten the meaning of the First Amendment? The First Amendment protects all forms of speech, even those we don’t personally agree with. Even those words that offend us personally are protected.

If our American public square or university becomes a place where only ideas accepted by the 1776 movement are spoken, it seems as if our very founding document is at risk of fading into the abyss of history.

Have we forgotten the meaning of the First Amendment? The First Amendment protects all forms of speech, even those we don’t personally agree with. Even those words that offend us personally are protected.

If our American public square or university becomes a place where only ideas accepted by the 1776 movement are spoken, it seems as if our very founding document is at risk of fading into the abyss of history.

How can political ideas be challenged if people cannot be allowed the freedom to speak different opinions? In Ternion College, the Chicago Police allow them, then we have lost our way and have become nothing more than an echo chamber.

How can political ideas be challenged if people cannot be allowed the freedom to speak different opinions? In Ternion College, the Chicago Police allow them, then we have lost our way and have become nothing more than an echo chamber.

HONORING OFFICER SEAN GANNON

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, so many people in this world are focused on: What’s in it for me? People in this world are focused on: What’s in it for me?

Not Officer Sean Gannon. Sean was a giver. His life was defined by his focus on serving and helping others.

Sean was taken from us last Thursday in an act of violence that shocked the world. But the elite academia of our university speech police may not allow controversial words—those words of Madison and Jefferson—to be taught on campus because it just might offend them.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I leave you with the words of James Madison: “The advancement and diffusion of knowledge is the only guardian of true liberty.”

Our college youth of today should heed the words of American youth of 1776. But the elite academia of our university speech police may not allow controversial words—those words of Madison and Jefferson—to be taught on campus because it just might offend them.

And that is just the way it is.
Forces of Russia stated: “The very rules of war have changed. The role of nonmilitary means of achieving political and strategic goals has grown, and, in many cases, they have exceeded the power of force of weapons in their effectiveness. The focus of applied methods of conflict has shifted to the utilization of the broad use of political, economic, informational, humanitarian, and other nonmilitary measures—applied in coordination with the protest potential of the population.”

Lieu– General Philip Breedlove testified before the House Armed Services Committee stating: “Russia sees the West, and in particular, a unified West, as an adversary. Waging a conventional war against the West would be unfavorable to Russia. As such, it has used hybrid warfare to break up Western unity.”

He went on to say: “Exploiting divisions in U.S. society and promoting a ‘culture war’ is one key element of Moscow’s efforts to weaken the West.

In 2015, Russia’s disinformation campaign against the United States impacted my home State of Missouri. Research conducted by U.S. Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Jared Pier found that Russian trolls and bot networks involved in the 2016 presidential election intersected themselves in the 2015 protests at the University of Missouri with the goal of inciting further unrest and spreading discord and fear. The Russian account @fanfan1911 tweeted: “The cops are marching with the KKK. They beat up my little brother. Watch out.”

The tweet was then retweeted by Twitter bots and hundreds of real Twitter users who fell victim to the hoax. Lieutenant Colonel Pier’s research found that this same Twitter account later changed its tweets to all German and spread rumors about Syrian refugees provoking unrest in Germany during the migrant refugee crisis. By 2016, the account switched back to English and began tweeting about the 2016 Presidential election.

Russia’s interference in the 2016 Presidential election by spreading disinformation on social media is troubling, and it showcases Russia’s success in weaponizing the internet. Russia has exploited political divisions with the intention to cause individuals to question the legitimacy of our democratic institutions. Russia’s ultimate goal, not to sway the outcome of elections, but to call into question the very foundations that make our democracy strong by provoking mistrust and instability into democratic institutions.

As Americans, we must wake up and band together to fight against Russia’s tactics. In Missouri and around the country, we have our own interfamily squabbles. Brothers and sisters may have arguments, but the minute the neighborhood and kid picks on one of us, we band together. It is time that we face the reality that Russia is exploiting our American family disagreements and making them far worse.

Instead of placing blame on each other and further polarizing our Nation, we should turn toward each other to develop a defense strategy to counter Russia’s propaganda machine. Russia is instigating fights on both sides of the aisle. They do not care if those fights are between political parties, but rather the demise of Western democratic institutions. It is time that we stop Russia from infecting our family with their disinformation virus.

I call on all Americans to judge inflammatory posts with a wary eye. We need to quit being naive, allowing ourselves to become a pawn of those who want our undoing.

The internet is now a battlefield. It is critical that we consider the source of all information we receive. That information could be from a Russian bot in St. Petersburg. It is time to stand united, talk to each other, and work together to solve the challenges of our times.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REV. DR. FREDERICK DOUGLAS REESE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama, Ms. Sewell.

Mr. Speak– today I rise to honor a mentor, a fellow Selma, Alabama, native, voting rights activist, and an American hero. Reverend Frederick Douglas Reese, who passed away on April 5, 2018, at the age of 88. Dr. Reese is best known for the pivotal role he played in the Selma to Montgomery march that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

It was Dr. Reese, as president of the Dallas County Voters League, who invited Dr. King and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to Selma to organize and support their local voting rights campaign. As a long-time educator, pastor, and civil rights activist, Dr. Reese’s life and legacy stands as a testament to the power of one man’s ability to change the world.

Dr. Reese was born in Selma, Alabama, on November 28, 1929, the only son of a strong, matriarchal family led by his mother, Ellin Reese, and that included his older sister, Doris Reese and Annie Ratliff. His strong educational and spiritual home environment, coupled with the Christian education training he received, was the solid foundation of his success.

An outstanding student, Dr. Reese graduated from Alabama State University and Livingston University with a degree in mathematics and continued his education at the University of Alabama, Southern University, and Auburn University before receiving his doctorate of divinity from Selma University.

Dr. Reese’s teaching career began in Wilcox County, Alabama, where he taught science for 9 years and, most significantly, met his future bride, Alline, a fellow teacher. The two were married on June 28, 1953, and she remained his lifelong companion for 64 years.

By the mid-1960s, Dr. Reese had returned to teach in Selma, Alabama, where he became the president of the Dallas County Voters League and president of the Selma Teachers Association. He used both leadership positions to actively educate Blacks in Selma about the right to vote. With courage and tenacity, Dr. Reese led the first Black teachers to support their efforts. The Dallas County Courthouse in which over 100 Black teachers demanded the right to vote. He challenged his fellow teachers to exercise their right of citizenship by saying: “How can we teach our civics if we ourselves cannot vote?”

As the president of the Dallas County Voters League, he invited Dr. King to Selma to support their local efforts, which initially worked in vain. It was not until the help of the CLC, Dr. Reese organized a voting rights march on March 7, 1965, a day that would live in infamy as Bloody Sunday. During the march, protesters were brutally beaten and sprayed with tear gas simply for speaking out for their right to vote.

The sacrifices made that day by foot soldiers like Dr. Reese were captured on national outlets and led to the rise of so many Americans who came to Alabama to support their efforts. The Selma to Montgomery marches which Dr. Reese set in motion led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. While many minority Americans continue to face barriers to the polls today, our progress as a nation is unmistakable. We have Dr. Reese to thank for that progress.

On a personal note, I know that I would not be here today as Alabama’s first Black Congresswoman were it not for the work of Dr. Reese and so many foot soldiers who led the way, who looked our democracy in the eye and made us hold up to those ideals. It was my greatest honor as a Member of Congress to present to the people of the United States of America the Congressional Gold Medal for his work in the voting rights movement on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Selma to Montgomery March:

Dr. Reese and others helped to change the course of American history and open the doors of opportunities for African Americans all across this Nation. We shall never forget the sacrifices that they made for our country.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama; a great, grateful nation; and the State of Alabama, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life and contributions of the Reverend Dr. Frederick Douglas Reese.

Dr. Reese was an American hero, a national treasure, a beloved Selma native whose life’s fight for voting rights will forever change the fabric of American history. May we all recommit ourselves to the cause he fought for by voting in every election: local, State, and Federal.
HONORING THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Civil Air Patrol and the contributions that our auxiliary makes to our great nation. The Civil Air Patrol supports America’s communities with emergency response; diverse aviation and ground services; youth development; and promotion of air, space, and cyber power.

The Civil Air Patrol consists of 1,445 squadrons and approximately 58,000 volunteer youth and adult members nationwide. It is congressionally chartered and operates as a nonprofit organization. It is made up of 8 geographic regions, consisting of 52 wings throughout the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, I had the privilege of speaking at the Pennsylvania Wing Civil Air Patrol’s 2018 Conference in Granville, Pennsylvania. More than 400 Civil Air Patrol members and cadets throughout the Commonwealth will gather there this weekend to celebrate this outstanding civilian auxiliary. Colonel Gary L. Fleming is the wing commander.

Mr. Speaker, this year, the Civil Air Patrol is celebrating its 70-year association with the U.S. Air Force. Congress passed a law on May 26, 1948, designating the Civil Air Patrol as the official Air Force auxiliary. The Civil Air Patrol cadet program has been in existence for more than 75 years. Cadet programs throughout the country are making incredible impacts. Cadet programs attract more than 25,000 members, ages 12 through 20.

The program educates youth in four main program areas: leadership, aerospace, space, and character development. It enriches the school curriculum through after-school programs. Programs offer orientation flights in powered and glider aircraft, as well as flight training scholarships. Activities and competitions are available for cadets at local, State, regional, and national levels. Opportunities for community development are available through the color guard and drill team, as well as emergency services missions.

The Civil Air Patrol makes up about 42 percent of each of the U.S. Air Force Academy’s classes. The cadets who have earned the General Billy Mitchell Award enlist in the Air Force, U.S. Coast Guard at higher pay grades.

Mr. Speaker, the cadet program also offers college scholarships in several different disciplines, as well as an international air cadet exchange program.

The Civil Air Patrol cadet program truly encourages our youth to reach great heights. They have been building leaders for more than 75 years, and I am so proud of the Pennsylvania Wing Civil Air Patrol Cadet Advisory Council for its incredible commitment to our youth. I wish them the best in advance of the annual conference later this week, and I look forward to joining them at that celebration as well.

DRAFT FARM BILL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House Committee on Agriculture will be marking up the most important bill that almost no one pays attention to, rolled out with very little fanfare. And actually, we can kind of understand why it has been sort of played down a little bit. The draft farm bill makes it more difficult to get SNAP benefits, while weakening the meager limits for farm subsidies and while cutting conservation and innovative programs which people care deeply about.

The draft bill cuts billions from those SNAP benefits. It creates burdensome work requirements for caretakers of children under 6 or between the ages of 50 and 59. Under this provision, people would have to find work or attend job training for at least 20 hours per week. The provisions won’t do anything at all to address poverty. Data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that, in the general population, securing a job within 3 months is virtually unattainable.

There will be a spirited debate about whether we ought to reduce nutrition for low-income people, but there are a whole range of other items that need to have attention.

The commodities programs that channel 94 percent of the subsidies in the farm bill to people who grow six commodities. This bill will exempt most corporate farms from payment limits and make it easier for large agriculture entities to call themselves family farms and get even more subsidies. It gets rid of payment limits for marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments and exempts partnerships, joint ventures, LLCs, and Subchapter S corporations from means testing, opening the loopholes wider.

In the area of conservation, which matters deeply to Americans across the country, making a difference to farmers and ranchers in Oregon, this bill gets rid of the Conservation Stewardship Program, one of the largest conservation programs in the farm bill. It cuts the conservation title by $1 billion over 10 years and cuts funding for the working lands program by nearly $5 billion over 10 years, and it weakens the Endangered Species Act by allowing pesticides to be approved without considering the impact on endangered species.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important areas that needs our attention deals with local food and regional infrastructure to promote local sustainably produced agriculture. It effectively eliminates funding for farmers markets, value-added producer grants, and cost-sharing programs for organic certification by failing to reauthorize mandatory funding for these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I spent the better part of 2½ years traveling Oregon after the last farm bill asking people what they wanted. And I will tell you, people in Oregon—farmers and ranchers, people who eat, sports people, people who are impacted with food and nutrition—this is not the approach that people in our community want, nor, frankly, by all available evidence, the vast majority of farmers and ranchers. They want to see reforms. They want to have a crop insurance program that isn’t wasteful support for large commodity producers, but actually is available for people who grow food, specialty crops for nursery, and the wine industry. It ought to be helping beginning farmers and ranchers get a toehold. It ought to deal with the efforts to cut down food waste, to provide protection for animal welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the draft proposal that has been released is a missed opportunity, a missed opportunity for the committee. But I am hopeful that Congress, as this process works out, will step up and do its part to make it better, to focus on people who eat; people who care about clean air, clean water; people who want to protect animal welfare; people who want to have a vibrant, thriving local food scene; and to be able to provide food security for people who are at risk.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. I strongly urge my colleagues to take a hard look at this proposal and think about what a farm bill would look like for our community. I think they will find this bill falls far, far short.

RECOGNIZING THE MIRACLE LEAGUE OF NORTHAMPTON TOWNSHIP

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an organization in my district that strives to empower individuals with special needs as well as their families.

The Miracle League of Northampton Township fosters both social and educational growth through sports and recreation. Along with buddy programs and coaching opportunities, Miracle League offers those with special needs the ability to participate in baseball, basketball, bowling, and soccer leagues.

On May 5, this organization will be holding its first annual charity wiffle ball tournament. The Miracle League of Northampton Township Wiffle Ball Tournament will feature a single elimination bracket along with awards for best team name and best uniforms.
I would like to recognize president Brian Damiani and vice president Allan Corless, along with the executive directors, board members, and volunteers, for the countless hours they put in to improve the lives of those in Bucks County.

**RECOGNIZING WARWICK TOWNSHIP FOR ITS RANK AS ONE OF PENNSYLVANIA’S SAFEST CITIES**

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we have no higher priority than working to ensure the safety of the communities we represent. Working with law enforcement and local officials is essential to meeting this responsibility. I am proud to recognize Warwick Township in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for being ranked as one of our State’s safest cities.

In identifying Pennsylvania’s safest cities, the statistics were compiled from the FBI Uniform Crime Report. This information indicated that Warwick Township was the 15th safest city in the State of Pennsylvania. I would like to thank Judith Algeo, chairwoman of the Warwick Township Board of Supervisors, and Police Chief Mark Goldberg for their hard work in keeping our district a phenomenal place to live, work, and raise a family. I look forward to continuing our mission together.

**MEMORIALIZING THE LIVES OF FRANK SKARTADOS AND JUDY KENNEDY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to memorialize two beloved elected officials from the Hudson Valley who passed away this weekend: Assemblyman Frank Skartados and Newburgh mayor, Judy Kennedy.

First, Assemblyman Frank Skartados represented a number of communities up and down the Hudson Valley. He lost a battle with cancer early Sunday morning. Even though he was struggling through his sickness, Frank still fought relentlessly for his neighbors up in Albany.

Frank was an immigrant from Greece, grew up on a small Greek island, came to America as a teenager, learned English, paid his way through school, and built a successful business. He went on to represent the people of the Hudson Valley and the State Assembly for nearly a decade. Now, if that weren’t enough, Frank shared a home in the city of Newburgh. Judy also passed away from cancer this weekend. She fought through her sickness to serve the people she cared so much about and the city she loved.

She was a relentless warrior for the people she represented. She brought the city of Newburgh through an economic crisis and presided over a real revitalization throughout that city. Our thoughts are with the Kennedy family as well, and, of course, the entire Newburgh community that will miss her leadership.

The public servants we lost this weekend were wonderful people. They dedicated their lives to the people they served, and the best way for us to honor their legacy is to finish their work, to look out for the communities they represented, and to make sure they stay the wonderful places to live, work, and raise a family that they are.

Frank and Judy, thank you for all you have done for us. I hope everyone in the Hudson Valley joins me in saying a prayer in remembrance of their service, and, of course, we will see them; we will see that whenever we see the government doing something right. We will see them when we see the city of Newburgh continue to thrive. We will see them when we see the State government improving our environment—working out for working families, fighting for people without a voice. That is where we will see their legacy, when we continue the work they fought so nobly and so long to advance.

Rest in peace.

**CONCERNS ABOUT AMERICA’S FOOD BILL**

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise concerns about the farm bill that we will consider in the House Agriculture Committee tomorrow.

In any legislation, there are parts of it that you support and there are areas that are problematic and there are titles that you may oppose. That is part of legislation. Some of these areas, of course, are works in progress. That is part of legislation as well. The farm bill is no exception.

There are parts of this proposal that are a continuation of good things that we have done in previous farm bills that have worked. This version of the farm bill supports programs that are critical to specialty crops in the San Joaquin Valley and across California and the Nation. Specialty crops are special. They are fresh fruits and vegetables that serve as the foundation of a healthy diet. California grows half of our Nation’s specialty crops.

This bill also provides support for research and risk management tools that are necessary. That includes continuous support for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, a program that encourages farmers to be good stewards of our environment. It also has proposals that support programs that help our farmers, ranchers, and dairy producers expand to foreign markets so we can compete.

Further, it also includes research and development of organic farming that continues to be very, very important, and it encourages a comprehensive approach to ensuring the health and security of our livestock. But we could do more in all of these areas.

There are also parts of this farm bill that, for me, are problematic. As written, the dairy provisions are unequally shared and they do not create an environment that protects some, while leaving others exposed, sowing a regional divide within the dairy industry.

Instead, we should raise the threshold for catastrophic coverage under the dairy safety net so we can respond more quickly for all dairy producers when milk markets plummet. The California dairy industry has hit hard times in recent years.

I also have concerns about the provisions of this farm bill that I strongly oppose, as do countless other organizations, people in the San Joaquin Valley and across the country. One of these proposals exchanges the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, otherwise known as SNAP, that will devastate parts of the farm program that are working well.

SNAP education and training programs are designed to help people and help recipients develop skills so ultimately they become self-reliant. I am a strong supporter of SNAP education and training programs. Although some of our SNAP education and training programs are yielding great results, we have a pilot project in Fresno County called the Fresno Bridge Academy that has expanded, and we now, as a result of the last farm bill, have 10 pilot projects around the country. In 2019, they are supposed to report back to the Congress to say what works and what doesn’t work.

That is the way we should be doing this so that we can get people off of assistance, make them self-sufficient. We all agree that able-bodied people should be working. Yet, this farm bill makes enrollment in the SNAP education and training program mandatory, and in many cases, without giving them the necessary tools to get real jobs that exist.

We have been warned that such a strain on burgeoning programs may very well collapse, costing billions of dollars, and creating a new Federal bureaucracy. In addition, this proposal would systematically prevent people from getting food assistance that they badly need, including our disabled, our seniors, and our veterans. Twenty-five percent of my constituents are on SNAP and require food assistance.

This program is vital to the health of our communities, both in rural and urban areas in every State in the Nation. The farm bill is America’s food bill. It is about our national security. It is very important. It should not serve some well and abandon others.

Although this proposal does include some good provisions, it fails to serve
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. McGovern 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 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATIONS MURPHYSBORO MIDDLE SCHOOL GIRLS VOLLEYBALL TEAM

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

Mr. Bost. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly honor the Murphysboro Middle School Blue Devils Girls volleyball team for winning the Class L State Championship for the second straight year.

Along the way, the team also captured their eighth consecutive Junior Southwest Egyptian Conference title.

That win was also a career milestone for Coach Mike Layne. It marked the 1,000th combined career win while coaching volleyball for Murphysboro Community Unit School District at both the middle school and high school levels.

I extend a heartfelt congratulations to the players, coaching staff, school officials, family, and friends who supported these young ladies on their incredible journey. Southern Illinois is proud of you.

Go, Blue Devils.

REJECT THE REPUBLICAN FARM BILL

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House Agriculture Committee will mark up the Republican farm bill. This incredibly partisan proposal was drafted in secret. Almost nothing in the bill reflects the 23 hearings our committee held on SNAP.

We heard from 90 experts, and not a single one of them said to us: Kick 400,000 working families out of the program and 265,000 children off of free school meals.

Not a single one of them told us to add hurdles for families with heating and cooling costs, and not a single one suggested we kick vulnerable adults off of benefits when they can’t find work.

Yet that is exactly what this bill does. The reckless Republican proposals in this bill cut SNAP benefits by over $20 billion, reducing or eliminating benefits for 2 million kids, veterans, working families, and other vulnerable adults.

Make no mistake, this bill will make hunger worse in our country. I plead with the Republican leadership of this House: Stop beating up on poor people.

MARKING TAX DAY 2018

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

Mr. Gianforte. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark tax day 2018.

I do not make it a habit of celebrating tax day, but this year is different. Tax day 2018 is the last time the American people will have to file their taxes under a complex, outdated Tax Code.

The new Tax Code lowers the tax rate for every Montanan. The reduced rates are creating larger paychecks. A teacher in Billings told me her take-home pay has gone up $1,500 a year.

The new Tax Code provides relief to Montana families by doubling the child tax credit. Parents will have more money to buy their children clothes, diapers, and food.

Today, I am celebrating tax day 2018 because we are putting that old antigrowth Tax Code out to pasture. In its place is a new, simpler Tax Code that cuts rates for all Montanans, helps families, and is growing our economy, leading to more jobs and higher wages.

ADHERE TO THE RULE OF LAW

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

Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Speaker, it is my task this morning to encourage my colleagues to adhere to the rule of law.

In keeping with that, my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee—Mr. Nader, the ranking member, myself, and Mr. Cohen—introduced H.R. 5476, the Special Counsel Independence and Integrity Act, to protect the work of Special Counsel Mueller and to allow his work to proceed.

In the recent days, Mr. Mueller’s prosecutors found information that generated questions about criminal activity. No prosecutor can ignore that kind of evidence. He referred it first to the Deputy Attorney General. Mr. Rosenstein then approved his potential referral of that information, and he did approve it. It was referred to the Southern District of New York.
We now come to find out that the President’s attorney has been investigated for a long period of time. We found out a surprise: one of his clients was Sean Hannity, who was already being investigated. This is the result of an Article I responsibility, a constitutional responsibility, and I encourage my colleagues to join us to provide that insurance.

SAVE A MAJESTIC SHIP FROM SINKING INTO THE DEPTHS OF HISTORY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the first board of her keel landed on the dockyard with a loud thump. It was 107 years ago today, April 17, 1911. One year later, she sailed smoothly into Newport News, Virginia, harbor, christened the USS Texas, BB-35. She was commissioned and saw immediate action in World War I. The Texas made numerous voyages to the North Sea, serving the country and our State of Texas.

Upon formal entry into World War II, the battleship Texas escorted war convoys across the Atlantic, was the flagship on D-day, and saw action in the Pacific as well. She was decommissioned in 1948.

Texas schoolchildren saved their nickels to bring the ship home to Texas. She is now moored in La Porte, Texas. But now after serving our great Nation, Texas is in danger of being scrapped for parts, a fate unfitting for a ship with a battle history.

To prevent this, the State of Texas and Congress must band together and work to save the battleship Texas from sinking into the depths of history. And that is just the way it is.

OPPOSE THE FARM BILL

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

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the recently released farm bill for 2018. Congressional Republicans and the Trump administration want to unravel the social safety net, and according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, this farm bill cuts total Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits—known as the Food Stamp program—by more than $23 billion.

Its stricter work requirements could affect 5 million Americans who receive food stamps in this country—children, seniors, the disabled, and, yes, veterans. The worst recipients who can work already do.

All told, 2 million would lose some or all of their benefits. To my colleagues I say, these are not just numbers on a page; these are people who are in need.

At the same time, Republicans want to expand the ill-targeted commodity programs. They will maintain crop insurance subsidies that have no eligibility requirements or limits.

This farm bill is not reform; it is hypocrisy. No one in this Chamber goes hungry. They have three squares or more. I urge my colleagues to defend the Food Stamp program and oppose this farm bill.

MARKET DATA PROTECTION

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Consolidated Audit Trail stands as the largest financial database in the world and ranks second in size only to the NSA’s database.

The value of the sensitive information housed within this database includes Social Security numbers, broker numbers, account numbers. In fact, it is comparable to nine times the wealth that is in Fort Knox—far more sensitive than the Equifax data, whose breach affects 145 million Americans.

Despite the enormity of wealth within this database, the unfortunate reality is that its cybersecurity is not yet adequate. The Government Accountability Office report found the SEC’s systems “at unnecessary risk of compromise.” The CAT operator recently delayed the issuing of technical specifications, which means that industry will have just 1 month to transmit all of this market data.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced the Market Data Protection Act, which passed this House with unanimous support, to guarantee the private information of hundreds of millions of Americans transmits securely and without risk. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues in the Senate to send this bill to the President’s desk.

TAX BILL BENEFITS THE WEALTHY

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today is tax day, the day that hardworking Americans finish preparing their taxes; and it is already clear, looking at the new tax bill, that it will overwhelmingly benefit CEOs, shareholders, and the wealthiest Americans.

Since the passage of this Republican tax bill, corporations have already funneled $250 billion to CEOs and shareholders through stock buybacks, money that is not going to workers. Stock buybacks overwhelmingly benefit the wealthiest Americans and corporate executives. In fact, the richest 10 percent of American households hold 84 percent of stocks.

The CBO just released information showing that this tax bill will increase the deficit by $1.9 trillion.

So let’s get this straight. The Federal Government borrows almost $2 trillion from our children and our grandchildren so that we can funnel hundreds of billions of dollars to the wealthiest Americans. Is that what we should be doing here? I think not.

SYRIAN CHEMICAL ATTACKS

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, President Trump and our British and French allies made it known that the heinous actions of dictator Bashar al-Assad will not be tolerated.

Over the past 3 years, Assad, aided by Iran and Russia, has continued to carry out chemical warfare against his own people. Not only is this in direct violation of Syria’s previous agreement to destroy their chemical weapons stockpile, but it also violates every tenet of basic human decency and violates our Geneva Conventions standards.

Through pictures and images, the world quickly saw the aftermath of Assad’s most recent attack on his own people: scores of people dead or dying while screaming at the mouth, including women and innocent children.

By aiding Assad’s murder of his own people and then working to prevent a response by the United Nations, Russia and Iran deserve equal blame and scrutiny when it comes to these attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to follow through with the sanctions on Russian companies that was announced by Ambassador Nikki Haley and to continue sending a clear message that these horrific criminal actions by the dictator, Assad, will not be tolerated.

BRING THE DREAM ACT TO THE FLOOR

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Speaker Ryan do the following: before he retires, do the right thing and bring the Dream Act to the floor.

Already 46 of his Republican colleagues and more than 170 Democrats—that is 218 bipartisan supporters—have, as of today, cosponsored H. Res. 774. This will force debate on competing DACA bills in the House and use a procedure known as Queen of the Hill. This will include four amendments, including Representative Roybal-Allard’s clean Dream Act and an amendment, H. R. 4796, the USA Act. Mr. Speaker, this will force a debate on this issue.

The Dreamers have the support of the American people and Members of Congress. Bring the Dream Act to the floor.
Mr. Speaker, Lottie was an extraordinary friend of mine. She helped me at every stage of my career, never wavering, never faltering. On good days and bad days, I knew Lottie would be there for me, as she was for so many of us. Her advice, wisdom, humor, and vast knowledge of life will be sorely missed.

THE REPUBLICAN TAX SCAM

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the corporations, the wealthy, and the well-connected enjoy lavish tax cuts, while retaining the ability to avoid paying any taxes whatsoever because of the many tax loopholes still in the Tax Code, millions of low- and middle-income Americans work diligently to complete their tax returns today.

The Republican tax scam has made the rich even richer, while economic inequality in America has gotten a whole lot worse. Sadly, most Americans say they have seen no change in their withholding taxes.

While the wealthy are reaping massive windfalls from the giveaways in the GOP tax scam, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that this tax scam will cause the annual deficit to soar to over $1 trillion in 2020, and an additional $3.4 trillion will be added to the national debt over the next 10 years.

Ending deficit spending and reducing the Federal debt is what Republicans have always claimed they were about, but we see now, with Republicans in total control, that they have misled us.

It is time to put this scam to bed, Mr. Speaker, and bring new order to this House. Shame on the Republicans.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5192, PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM IDENTITY THEFT ACT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 830 and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 830 provides for consideration of H.R. 5192, the Protecting Children From Identity Theft Act.

This legislation is designed to target something known as synthetic identity fraud. This begins when a criminal combines a real Social Security number with fictitious information, such as a name and date of birth, to apply for credit with a financial institution that poses information to credit bureaus for a credit check.

Credit bureaus create a record based on the fraudulent credentials. Over time, this creates a synthetic identity based on the valid Social Security number but a false name.

Currently, children and other vulnerable individuals are more likely to be victims of synthetic identity theft because they do not drive, work, or establish credit. This makes it easier for an identity thief to misuse the Social Security number of a child without being detected.

Reports indicate that over 1 million children have their identity stolen each year. Studies show that children are 50 times more likely than adults to be a victim of identity theft.

This is a real and serious issue that is only becoming more and more common. According to TransUnion, a record $355 million in outstanding credit card balances was owed by people who it suspects didn't exist in 2017. That is up more than eightfold from 2012.

This type of fraud can saddlle children with unintended debt and a flawed
It came out of committee 38–0. H.R. 5192 protects young children and recent immigrants from synthetic identity theft, a type of fraud that involves combining a legitimate Social Security number with a fake name in order to create a fake synthetic identity. One out of every 10 children have fallen victim to this type of threat. Research has shown that children’s identities are stolen at a rate of 50 times more frequently than adults, resulting in children and families shouldering unforeseen and unforeseeable financial and credit history that is extremely difficult to clear.

Mr. Speaker, in a refreshing change of pace, this measure, as I indicated, had a 38–0 vote coming out of the markup in committee and included input from Democrats, the IRS, and consumer protection advocates. Unsurprisingly, as I have indicated, it came out of committee overwhelmingly with all 16 Democrats voting in favor. The bipartisanship reflected in this bill is certainly a rarity in this body and, frankly, could have easily come before us under suspension of the rules.

It is now painfully obvious what the Republican majority’s playbook is. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle can work in a bipartisan manner if they want to, but when it comes to major issues facing our country, like taking away healthcare from 23 million Americans by handing a $1.5 trillion tax giveaway to America’s wealthiest citizens, they would rather force through partisan measures to the floor for a vote? The bipartisanship reflected in this bill came out of committee overwhelmingly with all 16 Democrats voting in favor, Republicans, including the President, PAUL RYAN urging him to bring forward a permanent legislative solution for the Dreamers, these young, hard-working individuals who are stuck in legal limbo. But despite this bipartisan support, not to mention the support of the vast majority of Americans, the Republican majority continues to block the Dream Act, ignoring the calls of the vast majority of Americans.

It is time for the Trump administration and Republican-controlled Congress to stop playing politics with the lives of Dreamers and come to terms with the fact that their long anti-immigrant wish list is not going anywhere fast.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is a place where the issues facing our Nation should be addressed and solved in a bipartisan manner, similar to this legislation. It is a sad state of affairs for the Nation that Congress has continued to sit idly by while the executive branch further engages our military in conflicts overseas without congressional authorization.

Republican leadership’s refusal to allow a robust debate on the efficacy of the executive branch’s military force for our presence in Syria is not only a dereliction of duty but does a great disservice to the country and our Constitution. If the President, any President, intends to further involve American troops in the Syrian conflict, or any conflict, then Congress has not only the responsibility but also the constitutional authority to lead that conversation.

Despite across-the-aisle support for these pressing problems, we are not here today debating the rule to address gun violence in America. We are not here today debating the rule to protect Dreamers from being removed from our
workforce or being deported to countries of which they have no knowledge. We are not here today debating the rule for the use of military force in Syria. We are not here today discussing immigration reform. We are not here today discussing infrastructure measure that is desperately needed.

When I came to Congress in 1992, there were 14,000 bridges in this country in need of repair. Today there are 54,000 bridges in this country in need of repair. But we are not discussing that here today. I yield my time for a moment.

Are my friends across the aisle intent on running out the clock before the midterm elections? Is that what the American people have to look forward to over the next 7 months? The people who sent us here deserve bipartisan solutions to the pressing problems confronting this great Nation. Not next time, not next week. Not tomorrow. But today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of my good friend from Florida. I do want to note the presence on the floor of our newest member of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Torres). We welcome her to the committee.

I do think there are bipartisan things that we can do. The gentleman said one that I think is very important: that is, infrastructure. He and I have had this discussion before. The President wants us to do an infrastructure bill, and I think all of us want to do an infrastructure bill. I think there is some time here we need to take to make sure that we do get a bipartisan bill in that regard. I don’t think it will pass without a bipartisan agreement, so I hope we do that.

On the gun issue, as I think the gentleman knows, the bump stock rule was actually something put in place by ATF under the Obama administration, and ATF has said the ATF essentially to rescind it, and they are in the process of doing that. So I hope they’ll do that.

We did pass, and this body is part of our appropriations bill for this fiscal year that went to the President, and been signed. The Fix NICS bill. So there are gun legislation things, addressing these issues, that are moving forward.

He also brought up the very important issue of immigration. The President, I think, has made some very bold moves in that regard, and tried to get a discussion going so that we can have some bipartisanship here. It is clear that that is not going to pass both the House and the Senate without that. I hope that those negotiations and those discussions can somehow resume because they clearly hit a very bad spot. The President has shown his good faith. I hope the rest of us can reach back and find a way to address this issue.

But this issue is not just the Dreamers. It is also border security. If we are not willing to talk about that and chain migration and the others, we are not really talking about immigration reform; we are talking about one piece of it.

With regard to the AUMF, Authorization for Use of Military Force, I am a strong advocate, as I think the gentleman knows, for a new AUMF. Actually, I am a cosponsor for one of the bills that would provide for that. I have said, going back several years, that I think we have been operating in certain parts of the world without adequate authorization. And whether it is constitutional or not, I think it is the right thing to do.

However, I do not think the President had to have prior congressional authorization before the strike that was launched Friday night against Syria by France and Great Britain. He clearly has that authority under Article II of the Constitution, to protect our servicemen and -women who are in Syria right now. So I applaud what the President did. But I am clear in my thinking that he did not need prior authorization from Congress to go there.

Now, I hope that we will get a strategy in general for Syria that fits into our overall strategy to the Middle East. We have been stumbling around in Syria for several years now. President Obama put out the so-called red line, and then the Syrians walked across it and used chemical weapons against their people. And we did nothing. All that did was encourage further bad behavior like what we saw in this horrible chemical attack on innocent civilians in Syria.

At least President Trump is doing something. And I hope that that something he has done will send a loud message, not just to the Assad regime in Syria but also to Russia and to Iran, that the civilized world is not going to tolerate that sort of activity. And we don’t care who does it; we are going to take appropriate action. The President had the authorization to do it, and I am glad that he did it.

We are not done legislating this year. I think the gentleman suggests that we are, but we have got some big bills coming before us. This week we will take up a major IRS reform bill. I am looking forward to that, this being tax day for so many of us. A good tax day for the vast majority of the people in America, by the way.

We will be taking up a reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration. We will be taking up another farm bill. We will be taking up the National Defense Authorization Act that comes out of the Committee on Armed Services that I am in.

We have a host of legislation that we will be doing, and I think doing successfully, between now and when we have these midterm elections in November. So we are not done legislating by any means.

I look forward to continuing to debate these issues, but today we are talking about a bill that did come through committee in a bipartisan fashion and, I believe, is going to get broad bipartisan support here in this body, once more showing the American people that we can get the people’s work done in the right way.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, through you, I would advise my friend that I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am as well.

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened very intently to my friend from Alabama, and he indicated that the action that was just undertaken over the weekend by this administration was ‘‘something,’’ and I maintain that it was under an old Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Listen, one of the reasons Congress won’t undertake to debate an authorization for the use of military force, well, the answer would give us a strategy if we had that debate and at least the administration would have Congress’ input with reference to the use of military force—we can’t continue to have pin pricks at the whim of any President. I argued the same thing during the Obama administration, and I argued it during the Clinton administration.

What we have done is abdicate our responsibility in Congress when it comes to war. And if you think it isn’t war, then ask the 500,000 people who are dead as a result of this measure undertaken in Syria, not just by the United States but with a variety of forces fighting inside. If you think it isn’t war when a bomb destroys a building, or 76 missiles destroy buildings, then I have news for you about what war looks like. And we had no input.

My understanding is the administration met with the leadership of the Republican Party. I don’t recall hearing a single Democrat was invited to have any discussion at all about this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud this bipartisan legislation, as I have said, that we, the IRS, and consumer protection advocates.

My friend from Alabama said that there are measures that are coming
forward, and I applaud him that those measures are coming forward. But I didn’t hear him say that there were going to be measures having to do with Dreamers. I didn’t hear him say there was anything that would be significantly involved and gun violence other than his view with reference to bump stocks and some reference back to some other date in time. I am talking about right now, not only bump stocks but the necessary indicia for buying a weapon and the age for buying a weapon and a variety of measures.

Twenty-six measures exist right here in the House of Representatives on which we could be voting—any one of them—that are commonsense gun reform. And we refuse to do so because the Speaker won’t put them on the floor.

I hope that we can continue working together across the aisle to confront the pressing issues facing this great Nation when the farm bill comes here, I hope that we have some instructions. They haven’t had any at this point. And we can help people whom we have been elected to serve.

However, it is time that we address gun violence in America; it is time that we protect Dreamers; it is time we exert our constitutional authority and debate a new Authorization for Use of Military Force. It is time for us to repair these broken-down bridges and raggedy roads in the United States of America.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of my good friend from Florida. I certainly hope that there can be some further discussions and we can have some of that comes forth on this floor that is truly bipartisan on the issue of immigration reform, including border security.

I know that there are some people, not including my friend from Florida, who would like to pass legislation that would repeal the Second Amendment. I hope that that legislation doesn’t come to the floor because I do not think it would meet with the approval of the vast majority of the people of America.

I do strongly believe at some point we should be debating on this floor a number of measures that exist across the United States. It affects millions of Americans each year. A recent study found that $16 billion was

SEC. 2. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.
(a) Attorney General Report.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the status of prosecutions for violations of section 1028(a) or 1028A(a) of title 18, United States Code, including—
(1) the number of defendants referred to the Attorney General for prosecution during the 5-year period immediately preceding the date of the report by any agency of the Federal Government, disaggregated by the number of defendants referred by each agency;
(2) a map of the United States indicating how many cases were referred for prosecution by agencies of the Federal Government in each judicial district;
(3) the rate, by year and judicial district, of convictions for cases described in paragraph (1) that were prosecuted; and
(4) the Attorney General’s recommendations regarding—
(A) identification of trends in the commission of such offenses;
(B) how to improve collaboration with other Federal agencies;
(C) how to improve law enforcement deterrence and prevention of such offenses; and
(D) whether such offenses are being committed by individuals or criminal organizations.
(b) Secretary of the Treasury Report.— Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to Congress detailing—
(1) current efforts by the Secretary to assist with the prosecution of violations of section 1028(a) or 1028A(a) of title 18, United States Code, wherein the defendant misrepresented himself or herself to be engaged in lawful activities on behalf of, or carrying out lawful duties as an officer or employees of the Internal Revenue Service;
(2) overall trends in the commission of such offenses;
(3) the Secretary’s recommendations regarding what resources are needed to facilitate improved review and prosecution of such cases; and
(4) information on what assistance the Internal Revenue Service may offer victims of such offenses.

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF REPORT.
Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall make the report submitted under section 2(b) publically available on an Internet webpage of the Attorney General.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. Jackson Lee) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.
stolen from more than 15 million American consumers in 2016.

In the last several years, sophisticated phone scams targeting taxpayers, including recent immigrants and elderly persons, have been prevalent throughout the United States. Callers claim to be IRS employees using fake names and bogus IRS identification badge numbers. The fraudsters sometimes know a lot of information about the targets, and they may even alter the caller I.D. to make it look like the real IRS calling them.

Victims are told they owe money to the IRS and that it must be paid promptly through a gift card or wire transfers. Victims are threatened with arrest, deportation, or suspension of a business or driver’s license. In many cases, the caller becomes hostile and insulting. In an effort to trick victims into sharing private information, these thieves sometimes claim that the refunds are ready for deposit. If the phone is answered, the scammers leave an urgent callback request.

These crimes must be prosecuted in order to protect victims and bring scheming criminals to justice. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2905, the Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act, which will help Congress better understand how many identity theft crimes are being prosecuted, as well as ways to prevent these crimes, bolster assistance that is made available to victims, and go after the thieves.

I thank Congressman DAVID YOUNG for his work on this bill, which will protect American consumers, and I urge the Senate to take it up without delay.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the manager of this bill, Mr. POE, again, for his continued leadership on issues of protecting the victim.

I know that everyone has either gone to their bank, been at a store, or gotten that call that says that: “Are you Mrs. Jones? You live in Texas. There is someone now in a department store in New York using your identity, your card, your credit card,” and nothing but fear comes your way. It may not be even if you having lost your credit cards, but it may be on the basis of the dastardly act of stealing your identity.

Probably there is nothing more, besides family and faith and country and God, that disturbs you most than to lose who you are. And so the legislation of H.R. 2905, the Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act of 2018, is a valuable legislative initiative because, every year, billions of dollars are stolen from hardworking Americans as a result of identity theft.

Tax season, as it begins today, or ends today, is a particularly dangerous time as scammers pretending to be IRS representatives trick victims into giving them money. Some of the most vulnerable victims are senior citizens or individuals who are not familiar with the likes of government responsibilities or actions.

The bipartisan bill, H.R. 2905, the Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act of 2018, helps ensure that Congress has the information it needs to make sure that law enforcement agencies are employing tactics to hold these criminals accountable and deter future crimes.

I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) for their astute leadership on this bill and for recognizing that victims are left helpless and hopeless sometimes.

As tax season comes to a close, millions of Americans are at risk of being exploited by emerging schemes where IRS agents and harass victims into providing personal information and money. The IRS estimates that more than $65 million has been lost to phone tax scammers in the past 5 years. These attacks are the most common during tax season, in March and April. Those are dollars that many valuable and important programs or responsibilities of our Federal Government could utilize, dollars that certainly don’t belong to criminals.

Often, scammers present themselves as the IRS and trick people into sending their money and personal information. As technology advances, so do the scammers. The IRS warned of a sophisticated phone scam targeting taxpayers, including recent immigrants, which has been making the rounds throughout the country.

Scammers claim to be IRS employees using fake names and bogus IRS identification badges. They may know a lot about their targets, and they usually alter the caller I.D. to make it look like the IRS.

By debating this bill on the floor of the House today, Mr. Speaker, we hope that we can send a far-reaching warning for those who may be watching or those who are watching to tell others: Please understand that the IRS has made it clear they do not do business that way.

Victims are told they owe money to the IRS and they must be paid promptly through a gift card or a wire transfer. That is not the way IRS does business. Victims may be threatened with arrest or deportation, suspension of a business or driver’s license.

Seek immediate help through counsel, through calling, directly, the IRS or your public servant that is nearby.

In many cases, the caller becomes hostile or angry. If the phone isn’t answered, the scammers often leave an urgent callback request. That is not the way the Federal Government does its business, or the IRS.

Scammers did comply with the victim’s request out of fear of the repercussions. Please do not adhere to these heinous and vile actions against you.

The Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act of 2018 requires the Department of Justice and the Department of the Treasury to report to Congress the efforts to combat the serious identity theft problem. The bill requires the DOJ to report on the status of prosecutions of identity theft crimes. It asks for recommendations regarding how this crime is committed, how to improve collaboration with other Federal agencies, and how to improve law enforcement deterrence and prevention of such offenses.

It also requires the Department of the Treasury to provide a report detailing its current efforts to assist in the prosecution of identity theft when a criminal impersonates IRS personnel and the resources they need to facilitate the prosecution of these offenses.

Please remember—I will say it again—the IRS does not do business this way. Be wary and reach out for help.

This information will provide a helpful insight into how law enforcement agencies are addressing the heinous problem that Congress wants to resolve, and we want to stamp out identity theft and the IRS scammers.

We need to ensure that Americans are being protected from these con artists who target and terrify Americans and that these thieves are held accountable for their criminal activity, and that is why I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2905, the Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act of 2018.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG), the author of this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my colleagues from Texas for their support of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan bill, H.R. 2905, the Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act of 2018.

Scams and identity theft are increasingly complex and growing problems. Americans lose billions of dollars to criminals—my colleague called them artists; that is what they are—executing identity theft and fraud each year. Many in the Third District of Iowa have spoken to me about their fear of having their identity, bank or credit card numbers, and other personal information stolen.

Mr. Speaker, imagine getting a call from your bank or credit card company explaining your information has been stolen. Or imagine having a Federal agent knock on your door because someone stole your Social Security number, or banking information.

□ 1300

This reality can turn a family’s world upside down. Millions of Americans have gotten that call, and many have lost everything because of identity theft.
The Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act of 2018 requires the Attorney General and Treasury Secretary to create and submit reports to Congress about identity theft and fraud across the United States.

In Internal Revenue Inspector General for Tax Administration, Russell George, said Americans submit up to 14,000 complaints about IRS impersonation scams every week. He also said IRS impersonation scams were “the largest and most pervasive impersonation scam in the history of the agency.” This is serious. These scams are indiscriminate and can impact any person at any time.

The report submitted to Congress by the Attorney General as a result of my bill—this bipartisan bill—will contain the number of defendants referred to the Department of Justice for identity theft and fraud, a map of the United States which shows where cases were referred, and a breakdown of conviction rates for cases prosecuted.

This bill also recommends the Attorney General provide information on how to improve collaboration with other law enforcement agencies and discusses trends in identity theft and fraud cases. The Department of Justice should suggest what we can do to deter criminals and prevent identity theft from happening.

The report from the Treasury Secretary will contain what efforts the Secretary has undertaken in the prosecution of IRS impersonation cases and recommendations for resources needed to assist victims of these crimes. As founder of the Bipartisan Task Force to Combat Identity Theft and Fraud, I have compiled helpful resources to ensure all Iowans and Americans have the tools and resources they need to stay informed and protected from these scams. I know my colleagues do this, as well, for their constituents.

The reports from the Attorney General and Treasury Secretary will help Americans protect themselves and their families, trick victims into giving them money. The reports from the Treasury Secretary will contain what efforts the Secretary has undertaken in the prosecution of IRS impersonation cases and recommendations for resources needed to assist victims of these crimes.

Mr. Speaker, fighting these criminals starts with knowing what is out there and being as prepared as possible, which is why I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this bipartisan bill. Mr. Speaker, in closing, again, let me thank Mr. LONG from Iowa for his presence here. And let me thank Ms. SINEMA, who has always been astutely concerned with the fairness to those who may be victimized by these dastardly acts. I reiterate again that they are common and -women, and Ms. SINEMA knows well the importance of protecting her constituents, so I want to congratulate her and Mr. LONG for this legislation.

Again, I want to emphasize how important it is that we take important measures to protect all forms of identity theft. But I want to use the terminology “victims” because, as I have said, senior citizens, people who are there alone; and, of course, families, individuals who are not experienced; and, in many cases, first-time filers, for example, of their IRS filing; and people who don’t have, or know, anyone to call, they are particularly in the eye of the storm.

I, again, reiterate—if you are listening to us—do not respond to those kinds of intimidating calls. Please call the IRS. Yes, you can call the IRS or your public servant that is nearby, or seek some relief in some other manner. Identity theft can occur in many settings. It can occur in public places where criminals watch you from a nearby location as you punch in your credit card number, or listen in on your conversation if you have to give your credit card number over the telephone. It can also occur if you receive application materials through the mail, or discard them without tearing up the enclosed materials. A first notice to everyone: those items should be shredded.

Many people’s information is stolen when they are inquiring to spam emails that promise them some benefit, but request identifying data. In some cases, criminals reportedly abuse computer technology to steal large amounts of personal data. With enough identifying information about an individual, a criminal can take over that individual’s identity to conduct a wide range of crimes. You know, from your own experience, you’ll get calls saying that this is the IRS. Maybe it is not a store in New York, but it might be a store in Istanbul, or somewhere beyond, that your credit card is being used.

False applications for loans and credit cards, fraudulent withdrawals from bank accounts, fraudulent use of telephone calling cards, or online accounts, is important to be reminded the world is getting smaller and these credit card accounts can be used all over the world. The amount of identity theft can be severe and can leave a person with no funds to pay for everyday living costs. Identity fraud can have a significant effect on your credit history.

If an identity theft uses your existing credit or applies for new credit, this could leave a footprint of debt or missed payments in your credit report, even to the extent that this individual gets more approval. Even if the criminal applies for credit and is rejected, this can still have a negative impact on your credit history, as each application for credit is recorded.

It is with these concerns that I applaud this bill, H.R. 2905, “Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act of 2018.” This bill and pass it as well. The Senate, down the hallway, should take up this legislation, it is bipartisan legislation, it is important to make sure that law enforcement helps ensure that Congress has the information it needs to make sure that law enforcement agencies are employing tactics to hold these criminals accountable and deter future crimes.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital, it is good legislation, it is bipartisan legislation, it is important to ensure the information it needs to make sure that law enforcement agencies are employing tactics to hold these criminals accountable and deter future crimes.

As tax season comes to a close, millions of Americans are at risk of being exploited by an emerging scheme where scam artists pretend to be IRS agents and harass victims into providing personal information and money. The IRS estimates that more than $65 million has been lost to phone tax scammers in the past five years. These attacks are most common during the high tax season in March and April.
Often scammers present themselves as the IRS and trick people into sending them money and personal information. As technology advances so do the scammers. The IRS warned of a sophisticated phone scam targeting taxpayers, including recent immigrants, which has been making the rounds throughout the country. Scammers claim to be IRS employees, using fake names and bogus IRS identification badge numbers. They may know a lot about their targets, and they usually alter the caller ID to make it look like the IRS is calling. Victims are offered money owed to the IRS and it must be paid promptly through a gift card or wire transfer. Victims may be threatened with arrest, deportation or suspension of a business or driver’s license. In many cases, the caller becomes hostile and insulting. If the phone isn’t answered, the scammers often leave an “urgent” callback request. Scared and confused, many victims comply with the scammers request out of fear of the repercussions.

The “Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act of 2016,” requires the Department of Justice and the Department of the Treasury to report to Congress the efforts to combat the serious identity theft problem. The bill requires the DOJ to report on the status of prosecutions of identity theft crimes. It asked for recommendations regarding how this crime is committed, how to improve collaboration with other federal agencies, and how to improve law enforcement deterrence and prevention of such offenses. It also requires the Department of Treasury to provide a report detailing its current efforts to assist in the prosecution of identity theft where the criminal impersonates IRS personnel and the resources they need to facilitate the prosecution of these offenses. This information will provide a helpful insight into how our law enforcement agencies are addressing the problem and what Congress can do to help improve the results.

We need to ensure that Americans are being protected from these con artists who target and terrify Americans and that these thieves are held accountable for their criminal activity. The House support H.R. 2905, “Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act of 2016.”

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to emphasize how important it is that we take important measures to protect against all forms of identity theft.

Identity theft can occur in many settings. It can occur in public places where criminals watch you from a nearby location as you punch in your credit card number or listen on your conversation if you give your credit card number on the telephone. It can also occur if you receive applications for “pre-approved” credit cards in the mail but discard them without tearing up the enclosed materials. Many people’s information is stolen when they respond to spam emails that promise them some benefit but requests identifying materials as a prerequisite.

With enough identifying information about an individual, a criminal can take over that individual’s identity to conduct a wide range of crimes. False applications for loans and credit cards, fraudulent withdrawals from bank accounts, fraudulent use of telephone calling cards, or online accounts. The consequences of identity theft can be severe and can leave a person with no funds to pay for everyday living costs. Identity fraud can have a significant effect on your credit history. If an identity thief uses your existing credit or applies for new credit, this could leave a footprint of debt or missed payments on your credit report. Even if the credit application for new credit is rejected, this can still have a negative effect on your credit history as each application for credit is recorded.

It is with these concerns in mind that we act on this legislation today. I support this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2905, as amended.

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

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

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

MOVING AMERICANS PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4403) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to protect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows: H.R. 4403

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 “Moving Americans Privacy Protection Act”.

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

(a) In General.—Section 431(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1431(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2)(A) The information listed in paragraph (1) shall not be available for public disclosure if—

“(i) the Secretary of the Treasury makes an affirmative finding on a shipment-by-shipment basis that disclosure is likely to pose a threat of personal injury or property damage; or

“(ii) the information is exempt under the provisions of section 502(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

“(B) The Secretary shall ensure that any personally identifiable information, including Social Security account numbers and passport numbers, is removed from any manifest signed, produced, delivered, or electronically transmitted under this section before access to the manifest is provided to the public.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4403, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today in support of H.R. 4403, the Moving Americans Privacy Protection Act, a bipartisan, commonsense bill, authorized by Congressman JEFF DENHAM and gentleman BILL PASCRELL. It was favorably reported out of the Ways and Means Committee by a voice vote last week.

This legislation will help put an end to the inadvertent disclosure of personally identifiable information, such as Social Security numbers and passport numbers that are transmitted on certain shipment documents to the U.S. Customs and Border Protection. CBP, as it is called, is required by law to make certain shipment data available to the public, but that information should not include personally identifiable information which may be erroneously included on shipment documents by carriers.

CBP maintains procedures for individuals to request confidential treatment for their personal information, but that process is slow. Plus, individuals probably would not seek confidential treatment if they don’t realize that their personal information was included on shipment documents in the first place.

Even if the release of such information is unintended, Federal agencies should not be putting Americans at risk for identity theft, credit card fraud, and unwanted solicitations. We cannot and should not be allowing these agencies to protect Americans from such risks and hold Federal agencies accountable.

This legislation would do just that by requiring CBP to ensure that such personal information is no longer disclosed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman DENHAM and my good friend, Congressman PASCRELL, the ranking member on the Subcommitte on Trade, for introducing this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I speak today in support of the Moving Americans Privacy Protection Act, which would require that U.S. Customs and Border Protection ensure that personal identifiable information is not publicly disclosed during an international household move.
Customs is currently required to adequately protect personally identifiable information that is provided on, among other things, international shipping documents. In order to fulfill this mandate, Customs currently maintains procedures that allow shippers to request confidential treatment of certain information.

However, it can often take Customs several months to make a determination on such a request. Some determinations are not even made until after the information has already been publicly disclosed. That is the problem.

As a result, personally identifiable information has been mistakenly disclosed to the public. This impact has been acutely felt by U.S. civil servants and military personnel, which make up a large percentage of international household moves.

Disclosing this information has increased the risks that individuals may be the victims of identity theft and credit card fraud.

I call on my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation that has support on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the coauthor of this legislation.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman REICHERT of the Subcommittee on Trade for yielding and for his work on this important issue.

Protecting Americans' personally identifiable information has been hotly debated in the Halls of Congress this month. Last week, we debated appropriate limitations on private companies' access, use, and distribution of private data.

This week in the House, we are moving a package of bills to improve the Federal Government's use of Americans' data to ensure that the government is doing everything to keep its citizens safe.

Private companies should not be selling personal information without consent, but unequivocally, the Federal Government should not be selling the personal information of its citizens and armed services members.

I introduced H.R. 4403, the Moving Americans Privacy Protection Act, to ensure that Federal agencies are taking the necessary extra step of removing Social Security numbers, passport numbers, and ID numbers from shipping information.

Currently, the Customs and Border Protection agency is not taking this step.

In absence of this action, when Americans move internationally, their information may be erroneously made public online.

Representatives from the Department of Defense, Department of State, the DEA, and FBI, and others have heard from their employees on numerous occasions that their information has been found for sale on the internet through the manifest disclosure process.

Annual Department of Defense moves alone are enormous in scope, with roughly 600,000 servicemembers and their families moving every year, of which 200,000 of those are going international.

In 2014 and 2015, the Army's Surface Deployment and Distribution Command issued separate advisories alerting servicingmembers to this issue.

We must do a better job of protecting our armed services members who are making a sacrifice to wear the cloth of this great Nation.

I want to be clear that there is merit to shipping and cargo statistics. We need to make them available for economic trend analysis, but that does not mean that we put our citizens and Armed Forces at risk in the process.

The manifest disclosure process should not be repealed. The CBP should be required to remove the sensitive data.

Chairman BRADY and Chairman REICHERT have identified this issue and unanimously reported the bill out of the committee last week. It is good governance and bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colead, Congressman PASCRELL, for his work on this bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, today is tax day, as if you didn't know that, and newly filed FEC reports show that the President's campaign paid his businesses $150,000 in the first quarter of this year, including $68,000 to the Trump Hotel in D.C., and $58,000 for rent.

Lobbyists in foreign governments continue to spend money at these hotels. We have no way of verifying what that income looks like or where it is coming from.

Candidate Trump said on the campaign trail: "My whole life I have been greedy, greedy, greedy. I have grabbed all the money I could get. I am so greedy.

Since the election, we have witnessed not just his own conflicts of self-enrichment at taxpayers' expense, but petty graft from members of his Cabinet and his administration, lavish travel on military jets and first-class tickets for personal reasons, and expensive office decorations. Lobbyists have been welcomed into agencies to write their own regulations.

His campaign and the White House is filled with the ranks of people who already have pleaded guilty: Michael Flynn, who sold his connections to Russia and Turkish dictators while working for Mr. Trump; and so many other associates and their connections to foreign governmental leviathans, and that is potentially a conflict of interest.

Bribery and grift might have a place in a crime family, but it has no place in the Office of the President or in the Congress of the United States, and this Congress has been absolutely derelict and complicit in the unprecedented conflicts of this Presidency.

Since February of 2017, I have been calling on the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to request the President's tax returns, which he has the authority to do under section 6103 of the Tax Code. I have called up resolutions. Eighteen times the committee and this House have voted against seeing the President's tax returns. Why?

Why did the President support giving rich people and corporations a giant tax cut? Why is he letting Wall Street and Big Oil write their own rules? Why are his children still running his company? Why has he not divested, as he was told to do by the ethics commissioner?

President Trump seems to have an unhealthy admiration for authoritarian leaders. He seems to have a vision of turning America into an economy and government run by his own greedy and connected circle of oligarchs. But subverting our democracy for personal gain while Congress looks the other way is poisonous to our republic and our democracy and it is an anathema to our values.

Today is tax day, the 452nd day of Mr. Trump's Presidency and the 452nd day this Congress has let him off the hook.

I call on the chairman of Ways and Means to stop delaying and get Mr. Trump's tax returns now, like every other President for the past several decades. The American people demand it. We owe it to our democracy to shed light on his conflicts.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from New York magazine.

[From New York Magazine, April 1, 2018]

501 DAYS IN SWAMP LAND

(By Joy Craner and Nick Tabor, Introduction by David Cay Johnston)

On the day he took the oath of office, Donald Trump delivered two messages about what to expect from his administration. First came the lofty promise of his inaugural address. "The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer," he vouched. "For too long, a small group in our nation's capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the
cost. Washington flourished—but the people did not share in its wealth."

The second message, which Trump delivered without speaking a word, was aimed at a much younger, very rich, audience. As the new president’s motorcade left the Capitol, rolling past knots of supporters and protesters, Trump’s pink Cadillac drove by the White House. With a faraway expression and his hand tented under his chin, Trump promised to preserve, was now besmirched by a gaudy, faux-gold sign bearing his name. The carefully choreographed stop sent a clear signal to the foreign governments, lobbyists, and corporate interests keen on curry in favor in Washington.

Oil companies, mining interests, insurance executives, foreign diplomats, and defense contractors all rushed to book their annual conferences at Trump’s hotels and resorts, where costs were gracefully addressed to them. After hiking the nightly rate to $653—32 percent higher than other local luxury hotels Trump collected $2 million in profits from the hotels during his first three months in office. By last August, the hotel’s bar and restaurant had hauled in another $8 million in revenue. And although Trump has pledged to give away any money his hotels earn from foreign governments, the plan contains a lucrative loophole: Employees at his hotels admit that they make no effort to identify guests who represent other countries, meaning that much of the foreign money spent at Trump’s properties flows directly into his own pockets. On March 28, a federal judge allowed a lawsuit to go forward that charges Trump with violating the Constitution by accepting money from foreign governments at his D.C. hotel.

In fact, although Trump refuses to disclose the details of his myriad business operations, he continues to enjoy access to every dime of the American taxpayer without speaking a word, was aimed at a much younger, very rich, audience. As the new president’s motorcade left the Capitol, rolling past knots of supporters and protesters, Trump’s pink Cadillac drove by the White House. With a faraway expression and his hand tented under his chin, Trump promised to preserve, was now besmirched by a gaudy, faux-gold sign bearing his name. The carefully choreographed stop sent a clear signal to the foreign governments, lobbyists, and corporate interests keen on curry in favor in Washington.

Oil companies, mining interests, insurance executives, foreign diplomats, and defense contractors all rushed to book their annual conferences at Trump’s hotels and resorts, where costs were gracefully addressed to them. After hiking the nightly rate to $653—32 percent higher than other local luxury hotels Trump collected $2 million in profits from the hotels during his first three months in office. By last August, the hotel’s bar and restaurant had hauled in another $8 million in revenue. And although Trump has pledged to give away any money his hotels earn from foreign governments, the plan contains a lucrative loophole: Employees at his hotels admit that they make no effort to identify guests who represent other countries, meaning that much of the foreign money spent at Trump’s properties flows directly into his own pockets. On March 28, a federal judge allowed a lawsuit to go forward that charges Trump with violating the Constitution by accepting money from foreign governments at his D.C. hotel.

In fact, although Trump refuses to disclose the details of his myriad business operations, he continues to enjoy access to every dime of the American taxpayer without speaking a word, was aimed at a much younger, very rich, audience. As the new president’s motorcade left the Capitol, rolling past knots of supporters and protesters, Trump’s pink Cadillac drove by the White House. With a faraway expression and his hand tented under his chin, Trump promised to preserve, was now besmirched by a gaudy, faux-gold sign bearing his name. The carefully choreographed stop sent a clear signal to the foreign governments, lobbyists, and corporate interests keen on curry in favor in Washington.

Oil companies, mining interests, insurance executives, foreign diplomats, and defense contractors all rushed to book their annual conferences at Trump’s hotels and resorts, where costs were gracefully addressed to them. After hiking the nightly rate to $653—32 percent higher than other local luxury hotels Trump collected $2 million in profits from the hotels during his first three months in office. By last August, the hotel’s bar and restaurant had hauled in another $8 million in revenue. And although Trump has pledged to give away any money his hotels earn from foreign governments, the plan contains a lucrative loophole: Employees at his hotels admit that they make no effort to identify guests who represent other countries, meaning that much of the foreign money spent at Trump’s properties flows directly into his own pockets. On March 28, a federal judge allowed a lawsuit to go forward that charges Trump with violating the Constitution by accepting money from foreign governments at his D.C. hotel.

In fact, although Trump refuses to disclose the details of his myriad business operations, he continues to enjoy access to every dime of the American taxpayer without speaking a word, was aimed at a much younger, very rich, audience. As the new president’s motorcade left the Capitol, rolling past knots of supporters and protesters, Trump’s pink Cadillac drove by the White House. With a faraway expression and his hand tented under his chin, Trump promised to preserve, was now besmirched by a gaudy, faux-gold sign bearing his name. The carefully choreographed stop sent a clear signal to the foreign governments, lobbyists, and corporate interests keen on curry in favor in Washington.

Oil companies, mining interests, insurance executives, foreign diplomats, and defense contractors all rushed to book their annual conferences at Trump’s hotels and resorts, where costs were gracefully addressed to them. After hiking the nightly rate to $653—32 percent higher than other local luxury hotels Trump collected $2 million in profits from the hotels during his first three months in office. By last August, the hotel’s bar and restaurant had hauled in another $8 million in revenue. And although Trump has pledged to give away any money his hotels earn from foreign governments, the plan contains a lucrative loophole: Employees at his hotels admit that they make no effort to identify guests who represent other countries, meaning that much of the foreign money spent at Trump’s properties flows directly into his own pockets. On March 28, a federal judge allowed a lawsuit to go forward that charges Trump with violating the Constitution by accepting money from foreign governments at his D.C. hotel.

In fact, although Trump refuses to disclose the details of his myriad business operations, he continues to enjoy access to every dime of the American taxpayer without speaking a word, was aimed at a much younger, very rich, audience. As the new president’s motorcade left the Capitol, rolling past knots of supporters and protesters, Trump’s pink Cadillac drove by the White House. With a faraway expression and his hand tented under his chin, Trump promised to preserve, was now besmirched by a gaudy, faux-gold sign bearing his name. The carefully choreographed stop sent a clear signal to the foreign governments, lobbyists, and corporate interests keen on curry in favor in Washington.

Oil companies, mining interests, insurance executives, foreign diplomats, and defense contractors all rushed to book their annual conferences at Trump’s hotels and resorts, where costs were gracefully addressed to them. After hiking the nightly rate to $653—32 percent higher than other local luxury hotels Trump collected $2 million in profits from the hotels during his first three months in office. By last August, the hotel’s bar and restaurant had hauled in another $8 million in revenue. And although Trump has pledged to give away any money his hotels earn from foreign governments, the plan contains a lucrative loophole: Employees at his hotels admit that they make no effort to identify guests who represent other countries, meaning that much of the foreign money spent at Trump’s properties flows directly into his own pockets. On March 28, a federal judge allowed a lawsuit to go forward that charges Trump with violating the Constitution by accepting money from foreign governments at his D.C. hotel.

In fact, although Trump refuses to disclose the details of his myriad business operations, he continues to enjoy access to every dime of the American taxpayer without speaking a word, was aimed at a much younger, very rich, audience. As the new president’s motorcade left the Capitol, rolling past knots of supporters and protesters, Trump’s pink Cadillac drove by the White House. With a faraway expression and his hand tented under his chin, Trump promised to preserve, was now besmirched by a gaudy, faux-gold sign bearing his name. The carefully choreographed stop sent a clear signal to the foreign governments, lobbyists, and corporate interests keen on curry in favor in Washington.

Oil companies, mining interests, insurance executives, foreign diplomats, and defense contractors all rushed to book their annual conferences at Trump’s hotels and resorts, where costs were gracefully addressed to them. After hiking the nightly rate to $653—32 percent higher than other local luxury hotels Trump collected $2 million in profits from the hotels during his first three months in office. By last August, the hotel’s bar and restaurant had hauled in another $8 million in revenue. And although Trump has pledged to give away any money his hotels earn from foreign governments, the plan contains a lucrative loophole: Employees at his hotels admit that they make no effort to identify guests who represent other countries, meaning that much of the foreign money spent at Trump’s properties flows directly into his own pockets. On March 28, a federal judge allowed a lawsuit to go forward that charges Trump with violating the Constitution by accepting money from foreign governments at his D.C. hotel.
approval to build a Trump Tower in downtown Buenos Aires. Ivanka Trump, who oversees the family business with her brothers, sits in on the call.

2017

1.24 Trump signs an executive order to fast-track the Dakota Access Pipeline. He claims to have sold the stock he owns in the pipeline’s builders—as much as $300,000—but offers no proof.

1.27 Trump issues the travel ban but leaves out Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt—countries where he has significant business interests. He paid as much as $5 million for use of his name on a tower in Istanbul, and he registered eight new businesses in Saudi Arabia during his campaign.

2/3 Trump’s net worth—a $2.9 billion net gain—has been estimated as much as $7 billion in bank stocks in 2016, orders the Treasury secretary to consider ways to roll back regulations on banks. The value of bank stocks soars nearly 30 percent during his first year in office.

2/14 Trump, who owned stock in large oil companies, allows oil companies to hide the payments they make to foreign governments in exchange for extraction rights. The move comes only two months after ExxonMobil, which lobbied for the concession, donated $500,000 to Trump’s inauguration.

2/21 Angela Chen, a consultant with ties to China’s ruling elite, buys a $16 million penthouse in a Trump-owned property.

2/20 The 12 golf courses in the U.S., rolls back a rule that limits water pollution by golf courses.

4/29 Overriding diplomatic concerns, Trump invites Philippine president Rodrigo Duterte to the White House. To gain favor with Trump, Duterte had appointed the president’s partner on the Trump Tower in Manila to be his envoy to the U.S.

5/7 The Metals Service Center Institute, which is pushing the Commerce Department for steel tariffs, holds its annual conference at Trump’s resort in Miami.

5/16 The Republican Governors Association holds a conference at Trump’s golf club in Miami, where members strategize with corporate executives over how to persuade the new administration to dismantle environmental regulations and enact other business-friendly moves. Trump’s take for the conference: $500,000.

5/19 Trump proposes slashing HUD’s budget—but retains a subsidy that has poured more than $90 million into a housing complex in Brooklyn where Trump has a financial stake.

6/16 Lynne Patton, an event planner and friend of the Trump family with no experience in housing, is put in charge of the HUD region covering New York and New Jersey—giving her a senior position in the agency that disburses federal subsidies to a Brooklyn housing complex from which Trump made $5 million in 2016. (Patton recused herself from matters involving the complex, after a congressional committee sent a letter to HUD.)

8/2 Activists protest against JPMorgan Chase, which lobbied to slash the corporate tax rate while Boeing paid Trump $1.5 million a year in rent at one of his office buildings.

9/19 Report reveals that the Pentagon spends $130,000 a month in rent at Trump Tower—more than twice as much as other tenants.

10/9 Trump International Hotel in Chicago hosts a two-day conference for the manufacturing industry.

10/10 An insurance-industry trade association holds its four-day annual conference at Trump’s resort in Miami.

10/13 The state of Wisconsin’s largest for-profit prison company, holds its annual conference at the Trump National Doral. The company poured $450,000 into Trump’s campaign and inauguration after Obama announced plans to end all federal contracts with private prisons. GEO also hired two of Jeff Sessions’ former Trump Organization employees, as lobbyists. The investment paid off: A month after Trump took office, he ended the ban on private prisons. GEO, which owns 12 golf courses in the U.S., paid $20 million for a new track to build a new immigration jail in Texas, plus $44 million a year to operate it. Earlier this year, the federal Bureau of Prisons announced it would slash some 5,000 jobs and transfer more inmates to private facilities.

10/18 Defense contractor L3 Technologies holds its annual meeting at Trump National Doral. L3 depends on government largesse for 84 percent of its revenue.

10/19 In a break with tradition, Trump personally interviews candidates for U.S. attorney in the districts that cover most of his business dealings. For the New York postseason, he ultimately chooses one of his campaign donors.

11/7 Trump hawks his golf course during a major speech to South Korea’s legislature.

11/18 A lobbying group announces it will hold its 2018 annual conference at the Trump National Doral. The move comes only two months after ExxonMobil, which lobbied for the concession, donated $500,000 to Trump’s inauguration.

12/21 Mississippi awards $6 million in tax breaks to a new Trump-branded hotel.

The company and policy and government are completely separated. We have built an unbelievable wall in between the two.”—Eric Trump

2016

11/3 While appearing on 60 Minutes to discuss her father’s election, Ivanka Trump wears a $10,800 bracelet from her jewelry company. After the interview, the company sends out a “style alert” promoting the bracelet to reporters.

12/6 Firm founded by Melania Trump’s friend, Stephanie Winston Wolkoff, receives $30 million for helping plan the inauguration.

1/5 Eric Trump jets to Uruguay to check on an unfinished Trump condo tower. The trip costs taxpayers $57,830.

2/5 Eric Trump spends $200,000 in taxpayer money to jet to the Dominican Republic to lavish for a Trump-branded project. The deal, which would put Trump’s name on 17 high-rises—violates a Dominican height limit for new resorts. It also breaks Trump’s vow not to have his federal officials lobby pro seekers for his presidency.

The Dominican president personally approves the high-rises. “Here in the palace, the president’s thoughts are that this U.S. president is angry and will be better not to have his name in my country,” a former Dominican ambassador explains. “We don’t want to cross him.”

2/6 Melania’s lawyers, saying a British paper for libel, argue its reporting ruined her “once-in-a-lifetime opportunity” to monetize her position as First Lady by cashing in on “multi-million-dollar business relationships.”

2/9 Kellyanne Conway offers “free commercial” for Ivanka’s clothing line on Fox News. She buys it today, everybody.” Trump refuses to discipline her, defying recommendation of his own ethics agency.

2/18 Taxpayers pay $16,000 to provide security for Eric Trump and Donald Jr. during their trip to open a Trump-branded golf course in Dubai. The event is invitation-only.

2/19 Report reveals that the Pentagon is considering scrapping a rule that requires payday lenders to stop taking advantage of clients who cannot pay off their loans.

3/9 Kushner fails to disclose his ownership of Starrett City, a housing complex in Brooklyn that Trump owns a stake in, can be sold to private developers. The sale is expected to bring Trump $15 million after the administration approves it.

3/20 Ivanka, refusing to place her assets in a blind trust, sets up shop in the West Wing. Kushner later steals her assets, according to a recent report.

3/21 CNN finds that even after his family business apologizes for name-dropping Kushner at a marketing event in Beijing, it highlights his White House role in an online sales pitch to Chinese investors.

3/31 Kushner’s family tries to broker funding for his real-estate ventures with Qatar’s finance minister. The minister declines. A month later, Kushner supports diplomatic actions against Qatar.


5/5 Trump extends fast-track visas for foreign investors who invest $500,000 in U.S. properties. The next day, Kushner’s sister promises to sell visas to Chinese investors if they put $300,000 into the family’s properties in New Jersey.

5/17 Kushner’s company is subpoenaed by federal prosecutors and the SEC for its role in the investment-for-visa program.

7/21 CNN finds that even after his family business apologizes for name-dropping Kushner at a marketing event in Beijing, it highlights his White House role in an online sales pitch to Chinese investors.

10/4 ProPublica investigation reveals that after Manhattan DA Cyrus Vance dropped a criminal investigation against Donald Jr. and Ivanka, their attorney arranged a fundraiser on Vance’s behalf, donating $32,000 himself and raising at least $9,000 more.

11/1 Apollo Global Management lends Kushner’s real-estate company $184 million—triple the size of its average loan—after meeting with him. Six weeks later, the SEC drops investigation into Apollo’s finances.

12/11 Kushner is exposed for failing to disclose that his family’s foundation—which he led for nine years—funded an illegal Israeli settlement on the West Bank. Just before Trump took office, Kushner tried to sway a U.N. vote against an anti-settlement resolution.

2018

2/18 Donald Jr. tours India to sell Trump-branded homes; several newspapers ran an ad dismissing a “conversation starter” with him—for an additional fee of $30,000.

OFFICIALS & THEIR PALS

“We are going to send the special interests packing.”—Donald Trump

1/19 During his confirmation as Treasury secretary, Steven Mnuchin fails to disclose a hedge fund he registered in the Cayman Islands to avoid paying federal taxes—the very thing he is supposed to collect as Treasury secretary.

2/12 During his confirmation as secretary of Health and Human Services, Tom Price fails to disclose an insider deal he got on stocks in a health company. As secretary, he will be in position to approve a drug the company has developed.
2/9 Reports reveal that a top White House aide, Chris Liddell, participated in meetings between Trump and the CEOs of 18 companies in which he held large amounts of stock. Federal officials, whose companies included Lockheed Martin, Walmart, JPMorgan Chase, and Dow Chemical.

3/16 Congressional investigators reveal that Trump’s transition team hired lobbying firms run by close associates, including one that represented the interests of Michael Flynn—who wanted to “rip up” American sanctions on Russia—fail to report $45,800 in fees he received from the Russian state media entity RT.

4/14 The White House stops releasing logs of visitors, concealing trips made by lobbyists and presidential aides. In Trump’s first two months alone, by one estimate, more than 500 executives and foreign leaders made unrecorded visits to the White House.

6/29 HHS Secretary Sebelius tours Baltimore—accompanied by prospective business associates being courted by his son. One administrator on the tour offers Carson’s daughter-in-law a contract worth $500,000.

11/5 New reports reveal that during his confirmation hearings, Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross failed to disclose that a shipping firm he owned sold goods to Vladimir Putin’s son-in-law. His new job puts him in charge of American trade policy with the country’s largest trading partner.

12/18 Under pressure from watchdogs, EPA chief Scott Pruitt terminates a $120,000 contract for a firm he has worked with in the past to dig up information on EPA staffers who had advised the firm on his policies.

1/22 “You all just got a lot richer.” Trump tells wealthy patrons at Mar-A-Lago hours after signing a massive tax giveaway to the wealthy.

2/27 Billionaire Carl Icahn, an unpaid adviser to Trump, submits a regulatory proposal that would raise the value of his investment in an oil refinery. During Trump’s first six weeks in office, Icahn makes an extra $60 million on the deal.

4/12 Marcus Peacock, a policy expert in Trump’s budget office, takes a job lobbying for private companies that represent his clients. The President’s Education Department last year, including coal regulations and environmental crimes.

5/19 Trump nominates K. T. McFarland, an advisor who once siphoned off $14,000 in campaign funds for “personal use,” as ambassador to Singapore.

8/1 A top aide to EPA chief Scott Pruitt, who oversaw the drafting of official policy memos during his tenure and is said to have been Pruitt’s closest professional aide, is expected to be named as the new head of the Environmental Protection Agency.

8/15 Two Trump campaign operatives register a new lobbying firm, Turnberry Solutions, named after the Scottish town where Trump owns a golf club. Its first client, Elmo Motors, hires it to help obtain government handouts.

10/17 Whitefish Energy, a Montana firm that employed the son of Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke, is awarded $300 million in a no-bid federal contract to restore storm-battered Puerto Rico.

10/26 Trump nominates J. Steven Gardner, a coal-industry consultant, to oversee enforcement of strip-mining regulations. The Senate votes up rejecting the nomination.

11/8 Kirstjen Nielsen, Trump’s pick to head the Department of Homeland Security, was guided through her confirmation by a lobbyist whose clients compete for DHS contracts. Privatizing the “sharpa” role in confirmations—work long performed by government staffers—opens up a brazen new frontier in corruption.

12/2 Thad Binge, a lobbyist whose clients include defense contractors, attended his confirmation hearing at a cost to taxpayers of $35,000, rather than in Washington, D.C.—a three-hour car ride—for a horse-riding date with Mike Pence.

1/12 Trump gives Kenneth Allen, a former lobbyist, a slot in his cabinet, making him the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

2/27 HUD Secretary Ben Carson spends $196,000 on a dinette set and lounge furniture.
exceeding the $5,000 legal limit for office improvements. 

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, while I respect my good friend’s right to voice his opinion and I respect the fact that he shared that information with us, I am disappointed, however, that he chose this moment to make those comments.

This is a bipartisan bill. In fact, last week, in the Ways and Means Committee, the information and the comments shared by members on both sides of the aisle were ideas that were shared that were bipartisan in nature. The bill was talked about in a positive way, and it was my hope today that we could have that same congeniality on the floor today rather than take a left turn into the land of the President’s taxes, because today we are talking about Americans wanting to protect their identity, and I think that is what Americans want to hear, is how is Congress able to help them today.

So from this side of the aisle today, Mr. Speaker, we are focused on just that. We are focused on passing H.R. 4403, the Moving Americans Privacy Protection Act.

It is a straightforward, commonsense, and once again I will say it, bipartisan, unusual in this day and age, but true in this case.

It puts an end to the inadvertent disclosure of personally identifiable information contained on shipment documents to CBP and holds the agency accountable.

The American people want to know that we are doing this kind of work.

This is a good piece of legislation that protects their identification, and helps the CBP and Congress by giving the language to Congress to hold the CBP accountable.

We are committed to providing legislative solutions that help protect Americans from having their identities stolen, and this bill does just that.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this bipartisan bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, H.R. 4403, as amended, passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUIRING NOTICE FROM SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY IN CASE OF A TAXPAYER ASSISTANCE CENTER CLOSURE

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5440) to require notice from the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of any closure of a Taxpayer Assistance Center, as amended. The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows: H.R. 5440

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, SECTION 1. NOTICE FROM IRS REGARDING CLOSURE OF TAXPAYER ASSISTANCE CENTERS.

Not later than 90 days before the date that a proposed closure of a Taxpayer Assistance Center would take effect, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall—

(1) make publicly available (including by non-electronic means) a notice which—

(A) identifies the Taxpayer Assistance Center proposed for closure and the date of such proposed closure, and

(B) identifies the relevant alternative sources of assistance which may be utilized by taxpayers affected by such proposed closure, and

(2) submit to Congress a written report that includes—

(A) the information included in the notice described in paragraph (1),

(B) the reasons for such proposed closure, and

(C) such other information as the Secretary may determine appropriate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. 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. 5440, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker. Taxpayer Assistance Centers, or TACs, are taxpayer service facilities operated by the IRS across the country. In 2017, more than 350 TAC locations provided face-to-face services to more than 3.2 million taxpayers.

TACs can assist taxpayers in making payments, answering questions about their account, and other services. These offices provide valuable services for taxpayers to assist them in fulfilling their tax responsibilities. TAC employees are often the only face taxpayers see in their routine interactions with the IRS.

As the IRS has moved more services online, the agency has made numerous changes to the operations of TACs. Last year, all TACs nationwide moved to an appointment system that drastically cut down on wait times.

H.R. 5440 provides important improvements and transparency for the millions of taxpayers who visit TACs nationwide. This important bill ensures that impacted communities are provided at least 90 days notice prior to the closure of a TAC.

Late last year, the TAC in Huntsville, Alabama, closed suddenly. This closure created problems for taxpayers right at the start of filing season.

Local taxpayers did not know that the office had closed, with some driving 50 miles to the TAC, only to find a sign on the door directing them to another office 70 miles away. As you can imagine, this can be incredibly disruptive for all taxpayers, but particularly those in rural areas. Fortunately, last month, the office recently reopened, albeit at significantly reduced hours.

The requisite 90 days’ advance public notice under this bill is required to be both through online means, but also non-electronic means. This can be accomplished through the use of local news or radio, posting notice at the local library, or other methods. This notice must provide information on alternative ways for taxpayers to obtain assistance.

Today, ensuring the IRS can address the needs of taxpayers wherever they are is critically important, while the IRS needs flexibility to allocate scarce resources. This bill marks an important step to providing transparency for those impacted.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Congresswoman KAREN HANDEL and Congressman TOM O’HALLERAN, for their time and attention on this important issue.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we recognize tax day today, it is fitting that we advance a bill that recognizes Taxpayer Assistance Centers are the primary face of the Internal Revenue Service in local communities.

H.R. 5440 was jointly introduced by Representative KAREN HANDEL from Georgia and Representative TOM O’HALLERAN from Arizona. It simply requires public and congressional notification prior to any closures of these critical centers.

Taxpayer Assistance Centers, or TACs, provide in-person help to taxpayers on a wide range of issues, including making payments, resolving questions, and authenticating identity. They are IRS employees who know the law and provide high-caliber assistance locally.

In fiscal year 2017, TACs served approximately 3.2 million taxpayers, down from 4.3 million served the prior
year. Unfortunately, this decline can be tied, in part, to the IRS’ recent prioritization of online services over in-person assistance. This shift is evident in multiple ways:

It is evident in the closure of 30 TACs since 2011, a reduction of over 7 percent.

It is evident in the substantial reduction in TAC staffing, a decline of about 30 percent during the same period that the centers were closed.

It is evident in the rigid requirement of appointment-only assistance, without allowing walk-in help, even just to pay one’s taxes. Indeed, the Taxpayer Advocate noted that about 30 percent of all TACs have either zero or one employee, resulting in virtual closures in about 111 sites.

These reductions impose hardships on local communities and limit taxpayers’ rights to quality service. These reductions in access and the resulting community disruption concern taxpayers as well as Members of Congress.

H.R. 5440 is a commonsense bill that requires the IRS to provide public notice, including through non-electronic means, 90 days prior to the closure of a Taxpayer Assistance Center. This notice ensures that affected taxpayers are aware of closures as well as information on alternative forms of assistance that is available. Importantly, the Secretary of the Treasury must notify Congress of the closure and provide the reasons for closing the TAC.

Face-to-face assistance is a critical element of the Internal Revenue Service. Many tax issues cannot be resolved via a website or a brief phone call. Taxpayer Assistance Centers are a vital part of our tax system, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation to ensure public and congressional notification prior to any closure of centers.

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

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. HANDEL), who has provided great leadership on this bill.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, as Americans file their taxes today, it is the very last time they will do so under the old, unfair Tax Code. Thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, hardworking Americans are already seeing the benefits of lower taxes and a robust economy: take-home pay has increased; companies are investing in infrastructure, R&D, and people, with billions of dollars in bonuses and pay increases, and even enhanced benefits.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act also makes the Tax Code less complex and makes the process of filing out our tax returns easier and less daunting. This time next year, in addition to most Americans paying less in taxes, most Americans will find that the tax forms are simpler and the process less complex.

Even so, Mr. Speaker, tax day will still come, and people across this country will still need to turn to the IRS for help and for answers about their taxes. That is why I am here today to speak in support of H.R. 5440. This bipartisan legislation, introduced together with my colleague from Arizona, Mr. O’HALLERAN, I thank, holds the IRS accountable for putting its customers, the taxpayers, first.

IRS Taxpayer Assistance Centers provide important services to taxpayers across the country, millions of Americans receive free, personal, in-person tax assistance each year.

All too often, however, these centers are closed with little to no notice, leaving taxpayers to generally fend for themselves. H.R. 5440 requires the IRS to provide adequate public notice about any proposed closure and ensures that impacted taxpayers in that community will have the representation they need.

Most of us dread even the thought of having to deal with the IRS, but today, through a package of bipartisan bills, Congress is moving forward to redesign and restructure the IRS so that its top priorities are in the right hands. H.R. 5440 is one aspect of these important reforms to refocus the IRS.

Again, I thank Representative O’HALLERAN and the entire Ways and Means Committee for their hard work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O’HALLERAN), the lead Democratic co-sponsor.

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him and the chairman of the committee for supporting my commonsense bill with the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. HANDEL), my colleague.

As millions of taxpayers across this country prepare to file their returns on time this week, it is vitally important that we provide taxpayers with the resources they need to properly comply with the law.

Taxpayer Assistance Centers play a critical role in communities across this country. Over 3 million Americans visited one of these centers in fiscal year 2017, many of whom traveled considerable distances to get their questions answered face-to-face. Arizona’s five Taxpayer Assistance Centers help thousands of individuals every year.

Enacting commonsense, less complicated Tax Code can be challenging for families. With the new tax law set to substantially change the current Code, it is more important than ever for taxpayers to get answers that will affect their bottom lines.

Over the last few years, dozens of Taxpayer Assistance Centers across the Nation have closed as the IRS sought savings. According to the national Taxpayer Advocate, over 7 percent of these centers have been shuttered since 2011.

Closing of these centers, which often receive walk-in visits, with little or no clear public notice is disruptive and undermines fairness.

While the IRS offers virtual help and assistance to taxpayers, the reality is that many older Americans and those with disabilities cannot meaningfully access or utilize such technology. People who are honestly trying to comply with the law should not have to navigate an IRS website, on a timely basis.

People in rural counties spend time and money to drive hours away to get their questions answered at Taxpayer Assistance Centers. That is time away from running their businesses, from their families, and from their communities. Issues like transportation barriers and childcare often complicate the process.

Our commonsense bill simply affirms the taxpayers’ right to quality service by requiring the IRS to notify Congress and affected communities at least 90 days before closing a Taxpayer Assistance Center.

Providing accessible, quality service to the people we represent is the most basic and important function we have as Members of Congress. Exploring innovative ways to expand technology is a smart strategy for Federal agencies and one Congress should encourage, we must make sure in-person service remains a viable and meaningful option for those Americans who need it, especially for the agency that, arguably, has the greatest direct impact over the most people in the country—the IRS.

This bill will hold the IRS accountable for making sure communities impacted by a Taxpayer Assistance Center closure have adequate notice and are informed sooner about alternative sources for assistance.

I thank Congresswoman HANDEL for working with me on this bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, having no further speakers, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I prepare to close, I want to reiterate the importance of Taxpayer Assistance Centers as the local face of the Internal Revenue Service. The Internal Revenue Service should be increasing this presence and not limiting it.

H.R. 5440 is a commonsense bill that requires the IRS to provide public notification of any closures 90 days prior to the closure of a Taxpayer Assistance Center. This notice ensures that affected taxpayers are aware of closures, as well as information on alternative forms of assistance that are available. This notice will help communities and taxpayers better answer their questions and comply with their tax obligations.

As I have said, this is, indeed, a commonsense bill, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
Mr. Speaker, as most of us are aware, the IRS has the ability to seize and sell a taxpayer’s property to satisfy unpaid taxes. However, given the profound impact of such a move on the taxpayer’s livelihood, well-defined safeguards govern these seizures. Nonetheless, the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee discovered last year that there are ways for the IRS to legally circumvent these protections.

While IRS auctions typically require a 10-day advance notice and the establishment of minimum bid requirements to ensure profits sufficient to cover the unpaid taxes, the IRS can forego these requirements by deeming seized goods as perishable. Under current law, perishable goods are defined as those that are likely to go bad, become greatly reduced in price or value by keeping, or cannot be kept without great expense to the IRS. If the IRS deems the goods seized to be perishable, it can sell them on the same day without any minimum bid requirements. This streamlined process can lead to seized goods being sold for significantly less than a normal auction would allow. 

H.R. 5446, the bill before us, puts in place much-needed safeguards on the same-day seizure and sale of a taxpayer’s property.

While we are discussing this bill today, I would like to talk a little bit about the Oversight Subcommittee’s findings that led us to this point.

Last year, the subcommittee first became aware of this issue after local news reports from Dallas, Texas, brought to light the 2015 seizure of a bridal shop, including dresses and sewing machines.

These goods were then sold immediately at auction within hours of their seizure. This left the owners with no means of earning an income going forward, while not fully satisfying their tax debt. Now, common sense would tell us that this sale was not in the best interest of the couple, whose livelihood was ruined, or the IRS, who did not fully collect the amount owed. Further investigation by the subcommittee also found that there were at least eight other instances of small businesses being liquidated using the perishable goods designation in the past few years.

In only two of the cases did there appear to be any foods offered as part of the sale. The subcommittee concluded that while the IRS’ use of this authority is limited, when it is used, the goods sold under this designation are typically the contents of a small business and are almost never in danger of immediately going bad.

To give you an idea of what I am talking about, the IRS designated things such as sporting goods, artwork, scrapbooking materials, automotive supplies, and workout equipment as perishable. Now, I don’t know about you, but when I think of things that are likely to go bad, I think of things that we produce in my home State of Kansas, like meat or dairy products.

As a result, this common-sense bipartisan legislation limits the IRS’s ability to seize and immediately sell a taxpayer’s property to only cases where the seized goods are actually likely to go bad.

I would like to thank the bill’s sponsor, Congresswoman JENKINS and Congressman CROWLEY, for all of their hard work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5446, and I thank Mr. FERGUSON for working with our office to bring this bill to committee and here to the floor as well. And I thank the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) for managing the time on this bill. This may be one of the last things she gets to do here on the House floor, and I just want to thank her for her friendship throughout the years, as well, and working in a bipartisan way with us on occasion.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague mentioned, this is a targeted bill to address the overzealous enforcement of existing law. These changes are needed because, as Mr. FERGUSON will point out as well, we have found ourselves in an environment where small-business owners have seen their property and products taken and sold within 24 hours.

To give, for example, as was mentioned by Ms. JENKINS, the 2015 IRS raid of Mii’s Bridal and Tuxedo shop in Garland, Texas. Claiming the owners owed back taxes, the IRS agents seized $17,000 in cash and $650,000 in wedding dresses and equipment like sewing machines. The agents then immediately auctioned off those items, even though their tax dispute was not settled and has not been contested. The agency argued that expedited procedures were needed because they said the dresses, as was mentioned, were perishable goods. These were not oranges or grapefruits, they were not apples or eggs, they were dresses.

By invoking the word “perishable,” the IRS didn’t have to post advance public notice of the auction or wait at least 10 days for sunlight to come in before selling the goods, as is normally required.

To say this is wrong is an understatement. Clothing, as we all know, is not really perishable. It will decay over time and when it is worn, but left to its own, it really doesn’t decay. It is not perishable.

And destroying an immigrant-owned business—an immigrant-owned business—within hours, that took decades to build, should never have happened in the first place.

How the IRS used civil asset forfeiture in this case goes against a bedrock principle of our country, of the
United States—the principle of due process.

In this case, the IRS acted without proper notice and outside the intent of the law. They seized property and sold it without knowing its true cost or its value.

Civil asset forfeiture is a tool that the IRS and other law enforcement agencies use to go after ill-gotten funds from human traffickers, terrorists, and other criminal activity.

Sometimes it is a necessary mechanism. I think we all recognize that. But only when used correctly and fairly.

Seizing the goods of a small immigrant-owned business and selling them immediately at auction under the false premise that they were perishable goods is a clear example of how the law should not be used.

Passage of this measure will ensure that abuses like this never happen again. I urge swift passage of this bill to help us take at least some steps to address the abusive flaws in the civil asset forfeiture procedure and give at least this one company some modicum of justice.

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

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), one of the leaders on this issue.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5446. This commonsense legislation makes a targeted but important reform to protect American small businesses by ensuring that the rules for seizure of perishable goods are restricted only to goods that are, in fact, perishable.

The fact that we are having to even comment or debate on the fact that a small business in Texas was destroyed by the actions of an IRS agent that determined that bridal dresses were perishable is unconscionable, and it should not happen, and it should not have happened then; and I agree with my colleagues from New York that it should never happen again, and this legislation will help ensure that.

Now, I don’t think we have to explain to anybody that, since these bridal gowns are not perishable, why is this bill even necessary? But it is a shame that we have had agents use this particular piece of legislation to actually leave a family destitute because of their actions of selling bridal dresses under the guise that they were perishable.

This legislation tightens up the law to eliminate the language that the IRS agents in Dallas and others across the country have used to justify their overreaching use of same-day sale provision, H.R. 5446 makes an important step to prevent the IRS from redefining these words to suit their own purposes, threatening the livelihoods of American small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sponsor this legislation to strengthen protections for small businesses and job creators, and I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” and do the same.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, let me thank Mr. FERGUSON, as well as Ms. JENKINS, for bringing this bill to the floor.

I don’t want anyone who may be watching this on C-SPAN and may be just waking up, tuning on the television, and looking at the incredible bipartisan that is happening here today to think they died and have gone to bipartisanship heaven.

Although much of the work that we are doing today is bipartisan in nature, it really is drastically different than the way in which the Committee on Ways and Means has conducted business in the most recent past in connection with the passage of the Republican tax bill. Democrats have called that a tax scam bill.

It had absolutely no input from the Democratic side of the aisle, certainly not here in the House of Representatives, in the committee, or here on the floor. Not reflective of any of the Democratic principles or values in that bill and its passage.

And as much as we are working in a very bipartisan way; this is not a reflection of my good friend Ms. Jenkins but more a reflection, I think, of the leadership of the Republican Congress in ramming a bill through the committee with proper hearings. Not having a single Democratic amendment offered in that process spoke very ill of the process itself.

Nobody cares about how sausage gets made. We know that. Nobody cares how legislation gets made. Nobody cares about how sausage gets made until they taste it and it doesn’t taste good. And I think that is what is happening right now with the American people.

This tax bill is falling flat on its face. This tax scam bill is falling flat on its face because it is not helping the people it purported to help in the first place. The greatest bait-and-switch probably in the history of our country went on in terms of what the President talked about, the people he was going to help, the middle class and hardworking people, and instead it all basically went to the wealthiest 1 percent and the wealthiest multinational corporations in the history of mankind.

They got permanent tax relief, and the middle class and working men and women in this country got bupkis. All right? And the reality is they know what happened here; They know that 83 percent of that bill went to the wealthiest 1 percent and 17 percent to working men and women and working poor people.

That is just obscene. That is not reflective of who we are as a nation or as a country or as a people, yet that is what happened, and in no small part because it was written in such a partisan way. The bill had not a single hearing within the committee and was brought to the floor all to meet a deadline of passing it before the Christmas and Hanukkah break. That was the only goal, so that my Republican colleagues could say they had achieved something, even if it was ill conceived and passed with rushed judgment.

And now we know about all the problems with the bill and all the fixes that have to take place; things that maybe could have been worked out had there been a more open process and more deliberative process and the inclusion of Democrats in that process. Just maybe.

So I don’t want anyone, again, to be watching C-SPAN or maybe turning on the news tonight and learning about all the bipartisanism that is happening here on the House floor—and it is good; these are good bills that we are working on together—and say: Did I die and something happened? Has the world been righted? Am I missing something? I want them to know: No. You are not missing anything.

□ 1400

That tax scam bill did pass, and it did go toward helping the wealthiest 1 percent and the richest multinational corporations in the history of the world, and the little guy is not getting very much at all. That is still the case. That hasn’t changed. And it is sad, but it is true.

I, once again, want to thank the gentlewoman for her efforts in bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor. But let it be known that this is more of an aberration and not the norm in terms of how the committee has been conducting business, nor has the House of Representatives been conducting business in the most recent past.

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

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank Congressman DREW FERGUSON and Congressman JOE CROWLEY for their leadership on this issue.

H.R. 5446 further strengthens the safeguards in place to ensure that goods being sold immediately are limited to those that are likely to go bad. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5446, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWING OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY TO PROVIDE TAXPAYERS INFORMATION REGARDING LOW-INCOME TAXPAYER CLINICS

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill
Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5438. And I am proud to join my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), in sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a short and sweet bill. It allows the IRS employees to provide taxpayers with information on low income taxpayer clinics. Specifically, IRS employees would be permitted to provide program details, including the eligibility requirements for receiving assistance from a low income taxpayer clinic, also where the centers are located, and how to contact them.

As many of my colleagues know, the low income taxpayer clinic program provides matching grants to organizations that serve low-income taxpayers as well as those who speak English as a second language. These clinics primarily work with taxpayers on dispute resolution issues with the IRS. They provide representation for audits, appeals, collection matters, and Federal tax litigation.

These clinics are operated by non-profit organizations or academic institutions, and services are provided for free or for a very small fee.

My district in North Carolina is served by one of the clinics that is operated by North Carolina Central University School of Law, a fine institution just to the west of my house.

North Carolina Central's motto is: “Truth and Service.” And this clinic allows individuals to come and get tax assistance from law school students who work under the supervision of the staff attorney there at the law school. I appreciate the hard work that those volunteers are doing in my community.

This legislation before us today would allow the IRS to notify our constituents of these clinics and their services. These clinics play an important role by helping taxpayers, and I am pleased to see this legislation move forward and see the help that it will give to our constituents by making available the tools available in their own communities. This is a practical proposal that will improve taxpayers experience with the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Congressmen Lewis from Georgia, my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, my friend, for partnering with me on this bill. This bill was approved with unanimous bipartisan support by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Last December, the Oversight Subcommittee held a hearing on the taxpayer clinics for those who might be eligible.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5438. And I am proud to join my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), in sponsoring this bill.

Our Office of Appeals to ensure that tax resolution issues with the IRS.

H.R. 5438 would allow the IRS to share information about low income taxpayer clinics for those who might be eligible.

Last December, the Oversight Subcommittee held a hearing on the taxpayers experience. It was one of many bipartisan meetings to improve tax administration. During the hearing, we heard testimony from Ms. Tameka R. Lester and other witnesses shared their experiences and offered many great suggestions.

H.R. 5438 responds to one of the many issues raised in our discussion. Going forward, I hope that our committee and the House of Representatives will continue to develop bipartisan responses to their concerns and suggestions.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I hope all of our colleagues will support our bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his support, and I urge all Members of the House to support this commonsense legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the IRS is long overdue for an update, and today's bills mark a significant step in providing a reform that the agency needs and the American people deserve.

Late last year, House and Senate Republicans ushered through a new and improved Tax Code which allows individuals to keep more of their hard-earned tax dollars. Along with the new Tax Code, we need a new and improved IRS. The multiple bills we are taking up today accomplish that goal to some degree.

The taxpayer needs to come first. I am glad that Republicans and Democrats in the Ways and Means Committee have come together to work and make this a reality.

The bills before the House today are centered on improving the functionality and the taxpayers experience with the IRS. From directing the IRS to develop a customer service strategy, to codifying the Free File program, we are reframing the IRS into an agency that works for the American people.

It puts the American people first. These bills will improve the ease and efficiency of filing taxes and retrieving information.

We also established an independent Office of Appeals to ensure that taxpayers receive a fair and impartial review of any disputes that may arise. But most of all, we guarantee that customer service goals set by the IRS and that we assure the IRS is accountable for meeting them.

That is not all. Mr. Speaker, in today's world, the value of privacy cannot be understated. The IRS continues to face serious cyber threats that are becoming more and more advanced. It is necessary that the IRS stay ahead of these threats.

Mr. Speaker, today we are faced with an incredible opportunity to modernize the IRS and put the American taxpayer first. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill, H.R. 5438, and other bills that are before the House.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the motion made by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5438, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rule, the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5437) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a program for the issuance of identity protection personal identification numbers, as amended.

The Clerk reads the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5437

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

SECTION 1. IDENTITY PROTECTION PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS.

Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate (hereafter referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall establish a program to issue, upon the request of any individual, a number which may be used in connection with such individual's social security number (or other identifying information with respect to such individual as determined by the Secretary) to assist the Secretary in verifying such individual's identity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) each will control 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5437, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5437, legislation that I am coauthoring with my colleague, Congresswoman DELBENE from Washington State, that will tackle identity theft.

Each year the IRS processes over 240 million tax returns and issues more than $400 billion in refunds. This makes tax season a prime target for identity thieves who steal billions of dollars from hardworking taxpayers by filing false returns. It is all too common.

More than 1.8 million people, including more than 13,000 Minnesotans were victims of tax identity theft in 2015, and in just the first 2 months of 2016, the filing season, the IRS identified more than 31,000 fraudulent returns with thousands more surely slipping through the cracks.

A Government Accountability Office report last year found that scammers attempted to file $14.5 billion in fraudulent tax returns in the 2015 tax season alone. For a criminal, the scam is simple and straightforward. You steal a taxpayer's Social Security number; you file a fraudulent return in their name; and then you collect the refund.

While this is a tremendous theft of taxpayer dollars, it is also a nightmare for victims who then have to work to clear their name with multiple law enforcement agencies and wait longer to receive their own tax refund.

Our seniors, in particular, are very vulnerable to identity theft, as they then have to struggle to navigate a bureaucratic maze to clear their name and then file an authentic return. There is one tool available though to some taxpayers that makes this scam a lot harder to pull off. It is called an identity protection PIN, or an IP PIN. It is a 6-digit number that is issued by the IRS to help the IRS then authenticate a tax return and validate the identity of the person who is filing it.

Today, IP PINs are available only in a couple of States and the District of Columbia, as well as to certain tax-payers who might be at high risk of identity theft.

This legislation today which we are taking up would expand this program by giving all taxpayers access and the option of signing up for an IP PIN over the course of the next 5 years as they phase this in. This will give all taxpayers peace of mind by allowing them to proactively protect their own identity from tax scammers, and it will save taxpayer dollars by preventing fraud that puts refunds into the wrong hands.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join us in supporting this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5437, and I want to thank my colleague, Mr. PAULSEN, for all of his work to help advance this important measure. This is a pretty straightforward bill with a straightforward mission: protecting taxpayers from tax identity theft and fraud.

I am sure everyone is familiar with a scheme that some enterprising criminals came up with to file fraudulent tax returns so that they could collect money that didn't belong to them. I am sure it is safe to say constituents in every one of our districts went to file their taxes only to find that they had been filed already, and someone else had claimed their return and their identity.

In response, the IRS instituted a smart, commonsense program to assign PIN numbers to affected taxpayers, without which they could not file their taxes. These six-digit numbers would be reassigned each year, and electronic refunds would not be accepted without them.

According to the American Coalition for Taxpayer Rights, it appears that this program has helped protect taxpayers and reduce fraudulent returns. The number of tax returns with confirmed identity theft dropped 32 percent from 2016 to 2017, alone, and 57 percent during the 2015 to 2017 period. Yet tax identity thieves are still claiming billions of dollars in fraudulently obtained refunds.

By broadening the IP PIN program to all taxpayers instead of only making it available to identity theft victims and individuals in pilot project States, we can be proactive in curbing tax-payers' personal information and hard-earned dollars safe, and we can make further progress in reducing the instances of fraud during filing season.

While we can and must do more to outwit cybercriminals and perpetrators of fraud, this program is a no-brainer that gives a better level of protection than exists today. I look forward to seeing this instituted for all of our constituents and hope we can build on this success to bring more personal security measures and 21st century technology improvements to the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, again, this is a straightforward and simple bill that will protect taxpayers across the country and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a reminder, next year, taxpayers will enjoy a very simplified and streamlined tax filing process that allows all hardworking Americans to keep more of their own hard-earned dollars. However, there is still a lot that needs to be done to help protect taxpayers by cracking down on identity theft, which is becoming more and more prevalent. This is a very commonsense, straightforward bill that will help tackle identity theft.

I want to thank not only Chairman BRADY for his leadership on some of the IRS reform efforts, but also my colleague Congresswoman DELBENE for partnering up on this issue as well.

It is a very common sense; it is bipartisan. By giving taxpayers who are at risk of identity theft the opportunity to request that PIN number, it will allow them to make sure that their tax return is secure, and authentic.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5437.

This bill addresses one of the most popular issues raised during our Subcommittee's comment period.

H.R. 5437 is very simple. It would require the Treasury Secretary to establish a program that would issue identity protection personal identification numbers (IP PINs) to taxpayers.

An IP PIN helps prevent tax-related identity theft and tax refund fraud. The IRS currently issues IP PINs available to a small group of taxpayers. If an IP PIN is not included for this group, the IRS system will automatically reject an electronically filed tax return. It is an additional layer of protection for these taxpayers.
H.R. 5437 would expand this program. This bipartisan bill would require the IRS to make an IP PIN available to any and all taxpayers. It does not matter where they live or work; every taxpayer will be able to request an IP PIN.

I would like to thank our colleagues—the Gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) and the Gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) for their good work and support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to support H.R. 5437.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5437, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT FOR TAX-RELATED IDENTITY THEFT VICTIMS

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5439) to provide for a single point of contact at the Internal Revenue Service for the taxpayers who are victims of tax-related identity theft, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5439

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

SECTION 1. SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT FOR TAX-RELATED IDENTITY THEFT VICTIMS.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall establish and implement procedures to ensure that any taxpayer whose return has been delayed or otherwise adversely affected due to tax-related identity theft has a single point of contact at the Internal Revenue Service throughout the processing of the taxpayer’s case.

(b) Single Point of Contact.—

(1) In General.—For purposes of subsection (a), the single point of contact shall consist of a team or subset of specially trained employees who—

(A) have the ability to work across functions to resolve the issues involved in the taxpayer’s case, and

(B) shall be accountable for handling the case until its resolution.

(2) Team or Subset.—The employees included within the team or subset described in paragraph (1) may change as required to meet the needs of the Internal Revenue Service, provided that procedures have been established to—

(A) ensure continuity of records and case history, and

(B) notify the taxpayer when appropriate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RENACCI. 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. 5439, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe that modernizing the IRS’ ability to administer our Tax Code is a critical next step following the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. I am pleased that today we are considering H.R. 5439, which creates a single point of contact at the IRS for identity theft victims.

I introduced this legislation with my good friend, Representative JOHN LEWIS. He and I have worked tirelessly over the last few years to protect the identity of taxpayers, having introduced legislation that has passed the House and was signed into law in 2015 that took steps to help reduce identity theft.

I was proud to reintroduce with him this Congress the Stolen Identity Refund Fraud Prevention Act that has nearly 20 bipartisan cosponsors and which included the provision that we are considering today.

Identity theft has become a growing concern in Ohio and across the United States. Unfortunately, it seems as if there is now constant news of individuals having their identities stolen due to massive data breaches. It is one of the most costly crimes to consumers and businesses, and it is the fastest growing white-collar crime in America according to the Federal Trade Commission.

As many of my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee have heard, I, myself, was also the victim of identity theft not too long ago. I understand the frustration, fear, and sense of helplessness that many feel when learning that a criminal has stolen their identity.

In 2016, a criminal stole my personal information and filed a return with my name, my wife’s name, our Social Security numbers, and other personal information. The thieves even had a W-2 from the U.S. Congress that contained a fake version of my information. I didn’t learn about this fraud until I received an IRS notice questioning a return I had filed—even though I had not yet filed.

Each year, thousands of families trying to resolve this same sort of headache have to prove to the Federal Government that they are who they say they are. That included me, right along with everyone else, creating this tremendous call volume the IRS receives on a given day. I had to go through that same process.

People thought: Wow, you had to go through the same process trying to get through to the IRS?

I said: Yes, I did. I had to reexplain my story every time I called.

This commonsense legislation will simply require the IRS to establish a single point of contact at the IRS for taxpayers who have been impacted by identity theft. This will help everyday Americans who have had to deal with the stress and inconvenience of having their identity stolen get the service they deserve from the IRS.

I thank Chairman BRADY, Ranking Member NEAL, and the Ways and Means Committee staff for moving this legislation forward, and I encourage my colleagues to support its final passage.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5439. I believe that this is one of my favorite bills.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to join my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), in introducing this commonsense bill, and I want to thank the gentleman for it.

The gentleman from Ohio and I share a passion and a commitment to this issue. Two years ago we introduced the Stolen Identity Fraud Prevention Act. Both believe that taxpayers should receive the help and support that they need and deserve, and I am proud to join him again today in sponsoring this bill.

In recent years, I also included this commonsense policy in the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee Democratic bill, the Taxpayer Protection Act.

H.R. 5439 responds to a frequent, ongoing concern of many of our citizens. This bill will help ease the frustration that victims of tax-related identity theft feel, and it addresses a top IRS casework issue in my congressional district.

H.R. 5439 establishes a single point of contact within the Internal Revenue Service for any taxpayer who is the victim of identity theft. As a result of this bill, the taxpayer will not need to start again from scratch every time they try to get an update on their case. Instead, the single point of contact would work with other IRS units to solve the taxpayer issue as quickly as possible.

This good, commonsense bill will help taxpayers across our country. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to support H.R. 5439.

Mr. Speaker, in good support, I would like to urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this commonsense legislation is a strong step forward in ensuring that the American people receive the customer service that they
deserve from the IRS should they have their identity stolen.

Along with my personal story, I have heard from countless constituents and Ohioans who have been frustrated by the hoops that they often need to jump through to get their identity theft concerns addressed, all while dealing with the fear and anxiety of having their identity stolen. This bipartisan legislation will provide relief by requiring a single point of contact within the IRS for victims of identity theft.

Again, thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. Lewis) for his support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Renacci) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5439, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUIRING ELECTRONIC FILING OF ANNUAL RETURNS OF EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5443) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require electronic filing of the annual returns of exempt organizations and provide for making such returns available for public inspection, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5443

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

SECTION 1. MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING FOR ANNUAL RETURNS OF EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) In General.—Section 6033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

"(n) MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING.—Any organization required to file a return under this section shall file such return in electronic form.",

(b) INSTRUCTION OF ELECTRONICALLY FILED ANNEX.—Subsection 6104(e) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Any annual return required to be filed electronically under section 6033(a) shall be made available by the Secretary to the public in machine readable format.",

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(I) In General.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to returns filed for taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSITIONAL RELIEF.—

(A) SMALL ORGANIZATIONS.—

(I) In General.—In the case of any small organizations, or any other organizations for which no information is available by the Secretary or the Secretary’s delegate (hereafter referred to in this paragraph as the “Secretary”), determines the application of the amendments made by subsection (a) would cause undue burden without a delay, the Secretary may delay the application of such amendments, but not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(II) SMALL ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of clause (i), the term "small organization" means any organization—

(I) the gross receipts of which for the taxable year are less than $200,000, and

(II) the aggregate gross assets of which at the end of the taxable year are less than $500,000.

(b) ORGANIZATIONS FILING FORM 990-T.—In the case of an annual return filed under section 511(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which is subject to the tax imposed by section 511(a)(1) of such Code on its unrelated business taxable income, or any organization required to file a return under section 6033 of such Code and include information under subsection (e) thereof, the Secretary may delay the application of the amendments made by this section, but not later than taxable years beginning 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rules adopted by this House, the Speaker suspends the rules and agrees to the attached amendment to the bill, H.R. 5443, as amended.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Kelly) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Lewis) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Kelly).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5443, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5443. This bill, in short, would ensure that all nonprofits file their tax forms electronically so that the charitable community can better assist those in need.

First, I want to thank Congresswoman STEPHANIE MURPHY today for cosponsoring this important legislation with me.

This provision is identical to one that my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Congressman BRUMENAUER, and I introduced in a larger tax package, the CHARITY Act, along with Senators THUNE and CASEY on the Senate Finance Committee in 2017.

Before I discuss this bill in greater detail, I want to look across the room to my great friend, Mr. JOHN LEWIS. It was in 2015 that Mr. Lewis and I crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge. It was at that time that Mr. Lewis stopped and spent some time with my grandson George. And as we were walking across the bridge, George, who was at the time 65 years old, said: "Grandpa, this is the 50th anniversary!" I said: "Well, Grandpa, this is the 50th anniversary.
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He said: "Well, Grandpa, how old are you right now?"

I said: "Well, George, I am 65." He said: "Grandpa, it may be hard for you to get across that bridge."

I said: "George, don't worry. If I can't walk, you can push me across."

That was a great weekend for George. And for Mr. Lewis, I have always felt he is such an iconic figure in this House for people who stood up for civil rights. That weekend was one of the most gracious weekends and best weekends with my son my grandson had. So I won't tell you how much I appreciate being with you on the floor today.

When it comes to charity, the American people are truly unique. In fact, Americans are the most generous in the world according to the new Almanac of American Philanthropy. In a first-of-its-kind survey, the almanac found that Americans out-donate Britain and Canada 2-to-1 and nations like Italy and Germany 20-to-1. What is more, more than half of almost every single income level in America donates to charity. That is remarkable, and it makes me proud to be an American and proud of our Nation's history of philanthropy.

In its earliest form the word "philanthropy" comes from the Greek term "philanthropia," which simply meant "love of mankind." The meaning has evolved over time, but, from the earliest days of human civilization, we have depended upon kindness directed towards strangers and others. We define "philanthropy" today as the practice of organized, systematic giving to improve the quality of human life through the promotion of welfare and social change.

Throughout every age, American philanthropists have demonstrated the power of giving to create great and meaningful change. In my own congressional district in western Pennsylvania, we have many wonderful organizations that demonstrate the power of giving back to our community.

In the energy sector, Pat Black and his family started a small, private foundation in 1993. Here is one individual who took it upon himself to create a charitable organization to give back to his community. And we have many other good corporate citizens in Erie, as well, such as Erie Insurance and Erie University. In a first-of-its-kind, Erie Insurance’s founder, H.O. Hirt, had a lifelong concern for others who were less fortunate, and
today Eric Insurance and its employees follow Mr. Hirt’s example and continue this tradition of giving of food and clothing and other drives that help out in the community.

And since it is tax filing week, all these same charitable organizations must file their tax forms, called 990s, which brings us back to why we are here today on the floor considering H.R. 5443. Our bill would make it mandatory that 990s be filed electronically going forward. Electronic filing, or e-filing, is not only more efficient; it costs taxpayers less and the IRS less to administer. This requirement will boost transparency in the tax-exempt sector by requiring all nonprofits to file their returns electronically.

Today, approximately 60 percent of all 990s are filed electronically, but the remaining 40 percent are still paper filed and not released as open data. In addition to requiring e-filing of the 990 form be mandatory for tax-exempt organizations, this bill would make sure these data are transparent. Transparency from nonprofits’ returns, says: “The more easily people can access that data, the better.”

A readable, searchable format that will help improve efficiency and accuracy and reduce fraud, e-filing has served as a highly effective tool in exposing scam charities, and it will make it easier to catch these few bad actors who are using tax donations for personal gain only.

For example, in 2015, the Federal Trade Commission, the District of Columbia, and all 50 States filed a lawsuit against four scam cancer charities calling themselves the Cancer Fund. Their owners had used over 95 percent of the donations available to the public in a machine-readable format.

So why is this important? Better 990 information, when searchable and available to the public, allows for better scrutiny and better transparency. Jacob Harold, president of GuideStar, which collects and disseminates information from nonprofits’ returns, says: “The more easily people can access that data, the better.”

A readable, searchable format that will help improve efficiency and accuracy and reduce fraud, e-filing has served as a highly effective tool in exposing scam charities, and it will make it easier to catch these few bad actors who are using tax donations for personal gain only.

For example, in 2015, the Federal Trade Commission, the District of Columbia, and all 50 States filed a lawsuit against four scam cancer charities calling themselves the Cancer Fund. Their owners had used over 95 percent of the $187 million in charitable donations for their own personal benefit. This lawsuit took almost 4 years because of the difficulty of analyzing thousands and thousands of pages of data that were filed on paper.

Our bill will correct that. Hundreds of millions of dollars from generous Americans were wasted because their donations were going to a fraudster and finding those researchers to find a cure for cancer. To take money away from cancer patients is just plain wrong and immoral. Our bill wants to make sure this doesn’t happen in the future.

Now, how would that happen? Changes could be brought sooner against these scam charities, in less than 1 year instead of 4, if the return information had been available electronically. There are countless examples that prove that this can be the case. The State of Michigan is a great model for just how valuable access to machine-readable data is. To date, Michigan has shut down the most number of scam nonprofits out of all 50 States. This is because of the Michigan attorney general’s ability to manipulate and analyze researchable data. This bipartisan bill would help expose these shams nationally by ensuring nonprofits are e-filing annual returns. Therefore, I urge my colleagues on both sides to support this important good-government, antifraud bill.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just thank my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania for their wonderful remarks. Say hello to your grandson George.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5443. Let me begin by thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentlewoman from Florida for their work on this bill. Mr. Speaker, I hope all of our colleagues will support this simple bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, having no further speakers, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY), the lead Democratic cosponsor.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the lead Democrat on this bipartisan bill which would provide government officials with the timely information they need to prevent and punish fraud in connection with charitable solicitations and the use of charitable assets.

I want to thank my colleague and colead from Pennsylvania, Congressman MIKE KELLY, for his leadership on this issue. I also want to thank the chairman, ranking member, and the members of the Ways and Means Committee which unanimously approved this bill last week.

Our bill would require charities to annually file the Internal Revenue Service form 990, the form used by tax-exempt organizations, in electronic as opposed to paper format. It would also require the IRS to make these electronic filings available to the public in a machine-readable format. Our legislation has been endorsed by the National Association of State Charity Officials, or NASCO, which is an association of State agencies that oversees charitable organizations.

The purposes of our bill is threefold: First, it would help law enforcement agencies and government regulators identify, shut down, and prosecute fraudulent charitable organizations that use financial contributions for their personal benefit rather than to help those in need.

Second, it would protect American taxpayers who make generous donations to charitable organizations and deserve to feel a sense of security that their hard-earned money is being used for its intended purpose.

And third, it would help reduce the often excessive and overlapping Federal and State filing requirements applicable to charitable organizations, on which these organizations spend considerable time, money, and resources complying every year. This would enable genuine tax-exempt organizations to focus more on their charitable mission, whether that is helping wounded warriors, sponsoring cancer research, assisting victims of gun violence, or other notable causes.

I would note that, in its letter of support for this legislation, NASCO states that having electronic data for all form 990 filers, as this bill mandates, would ensure that the States have the ability to identify and stop fraudulent activity and help more charities and donors more quickly and effectively. NASCO further states that the bill could result in returning to charitable organizations significant resources that these organizations must currently devote to compliance with unnecessary government filing requirements.

In closing, I respectfully ask my colleagues in this Chamber to support the bill, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to quickly follow suit.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers and am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Yes, it is true, Americans are a charitable group. In fact, we are the most generous people in the world. Our Nation’s history of philanthropy, charities, and loving people are the envy of the world. In 2016 alone, Americans gave $390 billion, with 63 million Americans, 25 percent of the adult population, volunteering their time, their talent, their energy, and their dollars to make a difference.

As a recent commentator noted, Americans have it in their DNA to be philanthropic. Of all the countries, we are the most generous. Because I know my colleagues have it in their DNA to support our Nation’s unique philanthropic history and charitable community, I urge them to vote in favor of this important legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5443, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule I, the Chair
declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair. Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. Love) at 4 p.m.

MAKING PERMANENT VOLUNTEER INCOME TAX ASSISTANCE MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. CURBelo of Florida, Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2901) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent Volunteer Income Tax Assistance matching grant program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2901

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

SECTION 1. RETURN PREPARATION PROGRAMS FOR LOW-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) In General.—Chapter 77 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 7526 the following new section:

SEC. 7526A. RETURN PREPARATION PROGRAMS FOR LOW-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

“(a) Establishment of Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Matching Grant Program.—The Secretary shall establish a Community Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Matching Grant Program under which the Secretary may, subject to the availability of appropriated funds, make grants to provide matching funds for the development, expansion, or continuation of qualified return preparation programs assisting low-income taxpayers and members of underserved populations.

“(b) Use of Funds.—

“(1) In General.—Qualified return preparation programs may use grants received under this section for—

“(i) wages or salaries of persons coordinating the activities of the program,

“(ii) developing training materials, conducting training, and performing quality reviews of the returns prepared under the program,

“(iii) equipment purchases, and

“(iv) expenses associated with remote or rural tax preparation services.

“(B) outreach and educational activities described in subsection (c)(2)(B), and

“(C) services related to financial education and capability, asset development, and the establishment of savings accounts in connection with tax return preparation.

“(2) Requirement of Matching Funds.—A qualified return preparation program must provide matching funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis for all grants provided under this section. Matching funds may include—

“(A) the salary (including fringe benefits) of individuals performing services for the program,

“(B) the cost of equipment used in the program,

“(C) other ordinary and necessary costs associated with the program. Indirect expenses, including general overhead of any entity administering the program, shall not be counted as matching funds.

“(c) Application.—

“(1) In General.—Each applicant for a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

“(2) Priority.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applications which demonstrate—

“(A) assistance to low-income taxpayers, with emphasis on outreach to, and services for, such taxpayers,

“(B) taxpayer outreach and educational activities relating to eligibility and availability of income supports available through this title, including the earned income tax credit, and

“(C) specific outreach and focus on one or more underserved populations.

“(d) Amounts Taken into Account.—In determining matching grants under this section, the Secretary shall only take into account amounts provided by the qualified return preparation program for expenses described in subsection (b).

“(d) Program Requirements.—

“(1) In General.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for, and shall conduct not less frequently than once every 5 calendar years during which a qualified return preparation program is operating under a grant under this section, periodic site visits—

“(A) to ensure the program is carrying out the purposes of this section, and

“(B) to determine whether the program meets such program adherence standards as the Secretary shall by regulation or other guidance prescribe.

“(2) Additional Requirements for Grant Recipients Not Meeting Program Adherence Standards.—In the case of any qualified return preparation program which—

“(A) is awarded a grant under this section, and

“(B) is subsequently determined—

“(i) not to be in compliance with program adherence standards described in paragraph (1)(B), or

“(ii) not to be otherwise carrying out the purposes of this section, such program shall not be eligible for any additional grants under this section unless such program provides sufficient documentation of corrective measures established to address any such deficiencies determined.

“(e) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) Qualified Return Preparation Program.—The term ‘return preparation program’ means any program—

“(A) which provides assistance to individuals, not less than 90 percent of whom are low-income taxpayers, in preparing and filing Federal income tax returns, and

“(B) which is administered by a qualified entity,

“(C) in which all volunteers who assist in the preparation of Federal income tax returns meet the training requirements prescribed by the Secretary, and

“(D) which uses a quality review process which reviews 100 percent of all returns.

“(2) Qualified Entity.—

“(A) In General.—The term ‘qualified entity’ means an entity—

“(i) is an eligible organization,

“(ii) is in compliance with Federal tax filing and payment requirements,

“(iii) is not disqualified from participating in a program under title IV of such Act,

“(iv) agrees to provide documentation to substantiate any matching funds provided pursuant to the grant program under this section,

“(B) Eligible Organization.—The term ‘eligible organization’ means—

“(i) an institution of higher education which is described in section 102 (other than section 102(c)(3)) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002), as in effect on the date of the enactment of this section, and which has not been disqualified from participating in a program under title IV of such Act,

“(ii) an organization described in section 501(c)(3) and exempt from tax under section 501(a),

“(iii) a local government agency, including—

“(I) a county or municipal government agency, and

“(II) an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4(13) of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4108(3)), including any tribally designated housing entity (as defined in section 4(22) of such Act (25 U.S.C. 4163(22))), tribal subsidiary, subdivision, or other wholly owned tribal entity,

“(iv) a local, State, regional, or national coalition (with one lead organization which meets the eligibility requirements of clause (i), (ii), or (iii) acting as the applicant organization), or

“(v) in the case of low-income taxpayers and members of underserved populations with respect to which no organizations described in the preceding clauses are available—

“(I) a State government agency, or

“(II) an office providing Cooperative Extension services (as established at the land-grant colleges and universities under the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914).

“(3) Low-Income Taxpayers.—The term ‘low-income taxpayer’ means a taxpayer whose income for the taxable year does not exceed an amount equal to the completed phaseout amount under section 32(b) for a married couple filing a joint return with 3 or more qualifying children, as determined in a revenue procedure or other published guidance.

“(4) Underserved Population.—The term ‘underserved population’ means populations of persons with disabilities, persons with limited English proficiency, Native Americans, individuals living in rural areas, members of the Armed Forces and their spouses, and the elderly.

“(5) Special Rules and Limitations.—

“(A) Duration of Grants.—Upon application of a qualified return preparation program, the Secretary is authorized to award a multi-year grant not to exceed 3 years.

“(B) Aggregate Limitation.—Unless otherwise provided by specific appropriation, the Secretary shall not allocate more than $30,000,000 per fiscal year (exclusive of costs of administering the program) to grants under this section.

“(c) Promotion of Programs.—

“(1) In General.—The Secretary shall promote tax preparation through qualified return preparation programs through the use of mass communications and other means.

“(2) Provision of Information Regarding Qualified Return Preparation Programs.—The Secretary may provide taxpayers information regarding qualified return preparation programs receiving grants under this section.

“(3) VITA GRANTEE REFERRAL.—Qualified return preparation programs receiving a grant under this section are encouraged, in appropriate cases, to—

“(A) advise taxpayers of the availability of, and eligibility requirements for receiving,
advice and assistance from qualified low-income taxpayer clinics receiving funding under section 7526, and
(b) provide information regarding the location of, and contact information for, such clinics.".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7526 the following new item:

"Sec. 7526A. Return preparation programs for low-income taxpayers.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2901, the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Partnership Act, that I am grateful to see brought before the House today.

The Volunteer Income Tax Assistance program is a matching grant program administered by the IRS where the Federal Government partners with the local community to provide free professional tax preparation services to individuals with an annual income of less than $54,000 and for those with a limited proficiency in English.

Today, April 17, is tax day, the deadline for filing returns. As Americans all across the country work to complete their returns, we are reminded of the dangers associated with tax return preparer fraud. Filing your return can be confusing, and unscrupulous preparers seek to take advantage of this confusion for their own profit.

They bring in business by promising larger refunds, refunds they are able to obtain by claiming inflated expenses, false deductions, or unreliable credits on their clients' returns. Some fraudulent preparers even siphon off refunds to their own pockets. However, when the IRS detects the false return, it is the taxpayer, and not the return preparer, who is then liable for any additional taxes and/or penalties.

Unfortunately, it is low-income and underserved populations, such as those with limited English, who are the primary targets of fraudulent preparers. It is a threat that my district in south Florida is all too familiar with.

Thankfully, the VITA program allows taxpayers to fill out and submit their returns accurately without the fear of being scammed—all free of charge. The VITA preparers are IRS certified, and at 94 percent, have among the highest accuracy rates of all preparers.

This program has enjoyed strong support in the past, regardless of administration or the party in the majority. H.R. 2901 would permanently authorize the VITA grant program while ensuring that VITA preparers continue to maintain their high-accuracy rates.

I want to thank Representative DANNY DAVIS for partnering with me on this legislation. I am appreciative of the work of Chairman BRADY and Subcommittee Chairwoman LYNN JENKINS, as well as the staff of the Oversight Subcommittee and the other House Committees on Ways and Means staff for their efforts on this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, this will help some of the most vulnerable people in our country, people who want to comply with the Tax Code. It will make sure that individuals who are eligible for certain benefits under the Tax Code are able to file their returns quickly and accurately. In short, this will improve quality of life for lower- and middle-income people in our country, especially in my south Florida district.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2901, the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Partnership Act, and support the VITA program, which helps our constituents file their taxes confidently and accurately.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as we recognize tax day today, I applaud this body for advancing H.R. 2901, the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Partnership Act.

I want to thank my colleague and commend him for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. It has been good working with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) and I look forward to continuing to do so.

This crucial program provides high-quality tax assistance to hardworking families to help those who can benefit from a program that is designed to help.

The Volunteer Income Tax Assistance program, or VITA, offers free tax services to people who make less than 200 percent of the poverty level, and to underserved populations including persons with disabilities, the elderly, and limited English speakers.

It is a prime example of smart Federal investment because each Federal dollar is matched by the private sector.

The demand for VITA services is great. The number of tax returns prepared by the VITA program doubled between 2014 and 2016. In 2016, VITA grantees filed more than 3.8 million returns, helping families claim about $1.1 billion in earned tax benefits. In Illinois, over 4,000 VITA sites were filed for almost $32 million in refunds.

With the new tax law, these high-caliber, in-person services are needed even more, especially in States like Illinois, affected by the SALT limitation. VITA services are top-notch. The Internal Revenue Service reported that VITA preparers have a 94 percent accuracy rate nationally on returns claiming the earned income tax credit.

This VITA services will make a real difference for individuals and families. VITA sites are skilled at ensuring that taxpayers get all of the tax benefits for which they are eligible. These savings, coupled with the savings of hundreds of dollars in tax preparation fees, put more money in my constituents' pockets to cover the essential costs like rent, groceries, and medical care.

H.R. 2901 makes important changes to the VITA program. For example, in addition to permanently authorizing VITA, the bill allows the Secretary to fund the VITA grants up to $30 million. We have fully exhausted the recent appropriations of $15 million. The IRS estimates that 70 percent of Americans are eligible to file their taxes for free.

Given the high demand and need, H.R. 2901 recognizes that the IRS should put taxpayers first by giving them access to high-quality free services, doubling our Federal investment in this quality matching grant program.

Madam Speaker, I want to acknowledge and recognize the wonderful VITA sites in Chicago—the Center for Economic Progress, City-Wide Tax Assistance Program via Ladder Up, and I am especially pleased that the United Way of Metropolitan Chicago helps champion this program in my hometown.

As these programs do, many VITA sites provide additional programs to increase financial stability for families, and I am grateful for their presence in Chicago and other places throughout the country.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank Ranking Members NEAL and LEWIS, Chairwoman BRADY and Subcommittee Chairmen BROWN and HELLEr, former Representative Mike Honda, former Representative Xavier Becerra, the United Way, and Prosperity Now for their leadership in providing the permanence of this program.

And as I know people are struggling and running trying to get there fast before the deadline expires to file their returns, I am glad to know that those who needed it were able to get help.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Thank you for your leadership. And I urge support for this program, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Madam Speaker, having no other speakers, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), for his tremendous leadership on this issue. If one talks to someone who has used this service to convey their earnest sense of relief and gratitude for something that is called...
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“free,” they save not only the cost of paying a tax preparer, but they also know that they have got all of the benefits for which they were entitled.

I represent thousands of low-income taxpayers, and the earned income tax credits provide them with the hope that oftentimes lights up their life when it is time to file. Some of them are able to get benefits that they didn’t think they were going to have, and so they give a real bit of thanks to those who helped the response and to you.

There are many adviser volunteers and I want to thank them—individuals who give of their time, their energy, their knowledge, their expertise, and their effort to make sure that low-income taxpayers are provided all of the assistance that they need.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to work on this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I yield back all of my time.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to first thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), for his hard work on this bill. Dr. DAVIS is someone who has committed his career to Americans who are struggling the most, and he is willing to work with anyone in this Congress who wants to help our communities get ahead, especially those who are struggling and who most need our help. It has been a true honor to collaborate with him on this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues once again what the VITA program is all about.

Every tax filing season, unscrupulous preparers try to take advantage of underserved populations by filing fraudulent returns on their behalf.

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Social Security Child Protection Act of 2018.”

SEC. 2. REISSUANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBERS TO YOUNG CHILDREN IN CASES WHERE CONFIDENTIALITY HAS BEEN COMPROMISED.

(a) In general—Section 205(c)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(c)(2)(B)) is amended—

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam 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. 1512, which is currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the history of this legislation begins in my district in Southlake, Texas. A constituent of mine called my office very distraught that her mail had been stolen, and with it, her newborn baby’s Social Security card and number. A week later, a felon with an extensive history of forgery, credit card abuse, and identity theft was apprehended, and in his possession was the Social Security card of my newborn constituent.

As you can imagine, every day the vast majority of the most vulnerable of our Social Security cardholders.

Members of this Chamber know Social Security numbers have become an increasingly valuable target for identity theft due to their widespread use throughout the financial sector.

Madam Speaker, children like my constituent are particularly vulnerable to Social Security number theft because usually, before the age of 13, they do not work, they do not drive, they do not try to get credit cards, and they don’t try to establish credit, which would extend the time a thief can use that child’s identity before the theft is even noticed.

Current policy does little to protect children whose Social Security cards and numbers have been stolen. I believe H.R. 1512 is the answer to this problem. This bill requires that the Social Security Administration issue a new Social Security number for a child age 13 and under when a child’s Social Security card has been stolen and the child’s parent or guardian demonstrates to the Commissioner of Social Security that it was stolen while being transmitted by Social Security to the child’s address, that is, by U.S. mail.

This bill is a commonsense solution. We need to combat identity theft. I encourage all Members to vote today to protect our constituents, especially our most vulnerable.

I thank my fellow Texan, LLOYD DOGGETT, for cosponsoring the bill and helping me introduce the bill. I urge all colleagues to join us in supporting this bipartisan bill.

I would also like to thank, Madam Speaker, my district staff who worked
on this problem so hard in the beginning and the committee staff who helped me shepherd this through to its chairman, Mr. JOHNSON, of the Social Security Subcommittee.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 1512, the Social Security Child Protection Act, which was introduced jointly by Representatives KENNY MARCHANT and LLOYD DOGGETT, both of Texas. I note that my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON, is also in the House. This means that Texas is serious about children and protecting them. This bipartisan legislation would protect children in cases where their Social Security card is stolen from the mail.

Most parents apply for a Social Security number for their child soon after the baby is born. They can do this easily and quickly in the hospital. The Social Security Administration then assigns a number to the child and mails the card to the child’s family.

Unfortunately, sometimes these letters do not reach their intended destination or be stolen from the mail. In fact, the Social Security numbers of children are highly valued by identity thieves. Fraudsters can wreak havoc, creating an extensive record of bad debt and fraud associated with a child’s number.

Currently, Social Security will issue a new number to anyone, child or adult, who can show that their number has been misused and that they have been harmed. However, in the case of a child, sometimes years go by before the family learns that a child’s number has been used for fraud.

Under the bill, the Social Security Administration would issue a child a new Social Security number if their card is stolen from the mail. The family would no longer have to prove that harm has occurred before the child can be issued a new number.

Madam Speaker, this is a commonsense measure, and I want to commend Mr. MARCHANT for thinking it up, thinking of it and responding to a need that was expressed to him by one of his constituents. It is a great measure. I am pleased to support it, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Plano, Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), who is the chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank my fellow Texans, Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. DOGGETT, for introducing this commonsense bill.

Children who have had their Social Security cards stolen from the mail before they are 16 years of age will be entitled to receive a new Social Security number. This helps these youngest victims of identity theft start out with a clean slate. It is the right thing to do, and I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

As the chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, I have been committed to doing all I can to protect Americans from identity theft. This bill helps us all do better. But Madam Speaker, while this bill will help child victims of identity theft, the fact is that it still doesn’t fix the real problem.

The real problem is that we use Social Security numbers to both identify and authenticate people. It just doesn’t make sense, but we have been doing this for decades, and I think it is time to put a stop to it.

When Social Security created Social Security numbers back in 1936, they were designed for a limited purpose: to track earnings and administer Social Security benefits for hardworking Americans. Back then, there wasn’t much thought about keeping your number secret. But as we all know, that has changed since these numbers are used for everything from getting credit to enrolling kids in school.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1512, the Social Security Child Protection Act, is a step in the right direction, and I urge all Members to support it.

I also want to take this opportunity to begin a serious conversation about the future of Social Security numbers and how we use them. I invite Members to join me on this American people deserve no less.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, the Social Security number really is a key to identity theft, and thieves have had a field day with these Social Security numbers and the identity theft and the invasion of privacy that occurs.

A few years ago, I authored a measure here in the House to remove this information from the Medicare card. The next session, finally in 2010, we were able to pass that through the House with the help of Representative JOHNSON. It was a bipartisan initiative.

Then the Senate didn’t pass it.

When Republicans took over control of the House, Mr. JOHNSON appropriately took the lead on that legislation, and he worked at it for a while, and, finally, in 2015, he got it passed to remove the Social Security number from the Medicare card.

As Representative JOHNSON knows, finally, now, 10 years from when we started in June of this year, it looks like both will begin getting their Medicare cards without the Social Security number on it, to protect their privacy and to avoid the exploitation that has occurred.

To his credit, Mr. MARCHANT has identified another group of vulnerable individuals: children. Carnegie Mellon did a study that reported that nearly 10 percent of America’s children have had their identity already stolen, and the Social Security number is a factor in that. That is significantly higher than it is for adults, some 51 times higher, according to the Carnegie Mellon study.

Children are particularly vulnerable in this regard because they don’t have a driver’s license. They are really kind of a blank canvas. They don’t work, and they don’t establish credit. This allows theft and fraud to go undetected for many years in some cases.

By the time that they are young adults, they could unknowingly be buried in debt and face delays in very important steps in their education, in their work, in getting their first job, in getting that driver’s license or applying for a student loan.

I salute Mr. MARCHANT for seeing that this is a problem. I am pleased to join him and my colleague, Mr. DAVIS, from Chicago in supporting this measure.

Children and their parents or their guardians acting on their behalf deserve a streamlined process that will allow for a child to be issued a new Social Security number long before any misuse occurs.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I will close.

I am pleased to note that H.R. 1512 and other bills before us today take important steps to decrease identity theft. I know that identity theft is one of the top issues that the Chicago Taxpayer Advocate addresses. Helping prevent identity fraud and helping taxpayers deal with identity theft are important improvements.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would like to say thank you to my colleagues on the committee who have worked on this bill, and especially Congressman DOGGETT, who has helped every step of the way.

H.R. 1512 is a very commonsense solution that is supported by the Association of Mature American Citizens and the AARP.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD their letters of support.
Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
24th District, Texas,
Washington, DC.

HON. KEVIN BRADY, 
24th District, Texas, 
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARCHANT AND CONGRESSMAN DOGGERT: On behalf of the 1.3 million members of AMAC, the Association of Mature American Citizens, I am writing in strong support of H.R. 1512, the Social Security Child Protection Act. This important piece of legislation offers more protection for children under 14 who have been victims of Social Security card theft. This bill is as timely as it is simple in protecting the identities of our nation’s children.

The Social Security Child Protection Act is a real-life solution to a real-time problem. As the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) recently reported, identity theft rose by 50% from 2014 to 2015. As millions of identities are compromised each year due to Social Security card theft, children are becoming a more attractive target to identity thieves. H.R. 1512 does more to stem Social Security card theft by making it easier for parents to request new Social Security numbers for their children when their Social Security card has been stolen, in transit, from the Social Security Administration (SSA).

Under current policy, parents of children under 14 are able to request a new Social Security number only when they can demonstrate harm has occurred as a direct result of Social Security card theft. However, demonstrating a level of harm requisite with current policy is difficult for most parents because children do not typically participate in activities where harm from Social Security card theft would be made apparent (getting a driver’s license, buying a home, opening a line of credit, etc.). H.R. 1512 would make it easier for parents to get a new Social Security number for their children because they would only need to show their child’s Social Security card was stolen in transit from the SSA—not that their child suffered harm.

As an organization committed to representing the interests of mature Americans and seniors, AMAC is dedicated to ensuring senior citizens’ interests are protected. We thank Congressman M Marchant and Congressman Doggett for their commonsense and practical solution to protect children from identity theft. AMAC is pleased to offer our organization’s full support to the Social Security Child Protection Act.

Sincerely,

JOYCE A. ROGERS,
Senior Vice President, Government Affairs.

Mr. MARCHANT. Again, I encourage all Members to make sure that children who have their Social Security cards stolen are protected.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1512, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM IDENTITY THEFT ACT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 830, I call up the bill (H.R. 5192) to authorize the Commissioner of Social Security to provide confirmation of fraud protection data to certain permitted entities, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. STEWART). Pursuant to House Resolution 830, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-68 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5192

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 “Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act”.

SEC. 2. REDUCING IDENTITY FRAUD.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to reduce the prevalence that is identity theft, which disproportionately affects vulnerable populations, such as minors and recent immigrants, by facilitating the validation by permitted entities of fraud protection data, pursuant to received consumer consent, through use of a database maintained by the Commissioner.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSIONER.—The term “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration.

(2) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” has the meaning given the term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).

(3) FRAUD PROTECTION DATA.—The term “fraud protection data” means a combination of the following information with respect to an individual:

(A) The name of the individual (including the first name and any family name or surname of the individual).

(B) The Social Security account number of the individual.

(C) The date of birth (including the month, day, and year) of the individual.

(D) A permitted entity.

(4) PERMITTED ENTITY.—The term “permitted entity” means a financial institution or a service provider, subsidiary, affiliate, agent, contractor, or assignee of a financial institution.

(c) EFFICIENCY.—

(1) RELIANCE ON EXISTING METHODS.—The Commissioner shall evaluate the feasibility of making modifications to any database that is in existence at the date of enactment of this Act or a similar resource such that the database or resource—

(A) is reasonably designed to effectuate the purpose of this section; and

(B) meets the requirements of subsection (d).

(2) EXECUTION.—The Commissioner shall establish a system to carry out subsection (a), in accordance with section 1106 of the Social Security Act. In doing so, the Commissioner shall make the modifications necessary to any database that is in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act or a similar resource such that the database or resource—

(A) is reasonably designed to effectuate the purpose of this section; and

(B) meets the requirements of subsection (d).

(d) PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE CONSUMERS.—The database or similar resource described in subsection (c) shall—

(1) compare fraud protection data provided in an inquiry by a permitted entity against such information maintained by the Commissioner in order to confirm (or not confirm) the validity of the information provided, and in such a manner as to deter fraudulent use of the database or similar resource;

(2) be scalable and accommodate reasonably anticipated volumes of verification requests from permitted entities with commercially reasonable uptime and availability; and

(3) allow permitted entities to submit—

(A) one or more individual requests electronically for real-time machine-to-machine (or similar functionality) accurate responses; and

(B) multiple requests electronically, such as those provided in a batch format, for accurate electronic responses within a reasonable period of time from submission, not to exceed 24 hours.

(e) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Before providing confirmation of fraud protection data to a permitted entity, the Commissioner shall ensure that the Commissioner has a certification that each permitted entity has in place a process for certifying that permitted entity is not more than 2 years before the date on which that certification is provided that includes the following declarations:

(1) eentity is a permitted entity.

(2) The entity is in compliance with this section.
The entity is, and will remain, in compliance with its privacy and data security requirements, as described in title V of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.) and as required by the Federal Trade Commission, which is responsible for the enforcement of section 604 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681b).

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall establish the amount to be paid by the users under this paragraph, including the costs of any services or work performed, such as any appropriate service of legal process, and any other costs or expenses associated with the lawsuit, in addition to any other recoveries as determined by the Commissioner.

(2) ELECTRONIC CONSENT REQUIREMENTS.—For a permitted entity to use the consent of an individual received electronically pursuant to paragraph (1), the permitted entity must obtain the individual’s electronic signature, as defined in section 106 of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. 7001 et seq.), and must develop a method to verify the authenticity of electronic signatures. The method must be capable of detecting any attempt to modify the electronic signature. The method must be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Federal Trade Commission.

(3) RELEVANT INFORMATION.—Upon discovery of any violation of this section or any certification made under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall have the power to immediately refer the matter to the appropriate law enforcement or regulatory agency. The Secretary may immediately refer to the appropriate law enforcement or regulatory agency any information it receives through its investigations of any violation of this section or any certification made under this section.

(4) INITIAL DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall not begin development of a verification system to carry out this section until the Secretary determines that such system is capable of detecting any attempt to modify the electronic signature. The Secretary shall immediately refer to the appropriate law enforcement or regulatory agency any information it receives through its investigations of any violation of this section or any certification made under this section.

(5) CONSUMER CONSENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Note: the only other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) of this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(6) CONSUMER CONSENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Note: the only other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) of this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(7) CONSUMER CONSENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Note: the only other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) of this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(8) CONSUMER CONSENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Note: the only other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) of this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(9) CONSUMER CONSENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Note: the only other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) of this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(10) CONSUMER CONSENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Note: the only other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) of this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(11) CONSUMER CONSENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Note: the only other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) of this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(12) CONSUMER CONSENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Note: the only other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) of this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(13) CONSUMER CONSENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Note: the only other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) of this section for a period of not less than 2 years.

(14) CONSUMER CONSENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Note: the only other provision of law or regulation, a permitted entity may submit a request to the database or similar resource described in subsection (c) of this section for a period of not less than 2 years.
own records. This would allow the bank to detect attempted synthetic identity theft. As under current law, banks would be required to get the consent of their customer in order to have the SSA verify information. 

Social Security would not provide any identity information back to the bank other than, yes, this is a match or, no, this does not match. This matching could occur more quickly than it does under current law, to reflect the way commerce is conducted today.

I am pleased that we were able to work in a bipartisan way to develop this legislation and to strengthen it as it moved through the committee process. We did so in several ways.

First, we made sure that users of the system paid the full cost of developing it and conducting the verifications. We did not want to detract from the main mission of Social Security, which is to make sure Americans receive their earned Social Security benefits on time and in full.

Second, we strengthened the security of the system to make it not subject to misuse. Americans' personal information must be kept secure, and Social Security must conduct the matching when the individual has given consent.

I am pleased to say that Social Security’s track record on this is strong, and I expect they will carry on with their protectiveness of Americans’ private data as they design a new system. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation to protect children and fight identity theft.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), the distinguished chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CURBELO for yielding and for introducing this commonsense and much-needed bill.

Mr. Speaker, synthetic identity fraud is a real problem with real costs to the victims. One million children have their identity stolen each year, and they deserve to be protected. This legislation will also help stop criminals from stealing $1 billion a year by ensuring that we can verify a person is who they say they are. Our commonsense and much-needed bill should be considered.

Synthetic identity theft is a growing problem. Social Security must quickly take steps to get this important fraud-fighting tool up and running. As chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, I intend to make sure Social Security doesn’t hold this up in any way.

While Social Security will provide this service, the users pay the full cost so Social Security’s budget won’t be impacted.

Social Security has an important job: to make sure those who are eligible get the benefits they deserve. I am committed to doing everything I can to protect all Americans from identity theft.

H.R. 5192, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act, is the best way to stop synthetic identity fraud, and I urge you all to support it. The American people deserve nothing less.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the lead Democratic co-sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5192, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act.

Mr. Speaker, most of us assume our children are safe from identity theft. Most children don’t have credit cards, and many don’t have bank accounts, so why would they be targeted? Unfortunately, there is a new type of crime on the rise known as synthetic identity theft. This crime targets children and accounts for billions of dollars in credit card fraud.

Synthetic identity theft is happening right now, and it is hurting real people. A 17-year-old girl in Arizona discovered she had accumulated over $275,000 in debt because her Social Security number was linked to eight scammers and 42 accounts, including mortgages, auto loans, and credit cards.

To pull off this fraud, criminals obtain a Social Security number with no prior credit history, and they use it to apply for a credit card under a fake name. While the first fraudulent credit card application is usually denied, the failed attempt creates a “synthetic identity” with credit bureaus. This allows thieves to apply for credit cards, other lines of credit, cell phones, and other activities that require a credit check. Over time, thieves are able to rack up more debt and ruin kids’ credit before they have a chance to build their futures.

Every day, Arizona families shouldn’t have to worry about their kids being targets of financial fraud and identity theft. Because financial criminals constantly use new tricks to steal children’s identities, we must modernize and strengthen ID verification for everyday financial activities.

Our bill, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act, fights back and gives Arizona peace of mind. By directing the Social Security Administration to modernize its ID verification system to allow for more transactions to be screened and verified, we are taking a commonsense step to ensure people are who they say they are. Our commonsense bill closes a key security gap, helping to stop synthetic identity theft in its tracks.

Thank you to Chairman BRADY and special thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), my friend, for passing this legislation to protect our children and crack down on fraudsters. Arizonans value their privacy, and they want us to work together to protect it.

I am happy to work across the aisle to bring financial criminals to justice and help hardworking Arizona families get ahead.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank my colleague, Ms. SINEMA. It is a pleasure to work with her and to team up, in a bipartisan manner, to fight fraud and to help the most vulnerable, in this case, the children. I am very grateful to her, for all her work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULGREN).

Mr. HULGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act.

I would also like to begin by thanking Leader MCCARTHY and my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, especially CARLOS CURBELO, for his support in bringing this legislation to the House floor.

H.R. 5192 will bring the Social Security Administration into the 21st century to assist the private sector in combating identity theft. Identity theft affects thousands, if not millions, of children and families a year. A report by Carnegie Mellon CyLab examined more than 40,000 cases of identity theft and found that 10 percent of children in the study had someone else using their Social Security number. Among other things, children’s identities were used to purchase homes and open credit card accounts.

According to the information recently published by the Algonquin Patch, Illinois ranks number seven in the United States for identity theft. The median loss for fraud is nearly $500. Credit card fraud is the most common type of fraud.

For example, in Wilmette, Illinois, the Social Security number of a 13-year-old was used by a fraudster to open a credit card with a plan to use it to pay for plastic surgery. Imagine what these children will go through when they get their first legitimate extension of credit, maybe a car loan or a student loan, only to find out that criminals have stolen their identities and wrecked their financial standing.

The Protecting Children from Identity Theft will strengthen the relationship between the public and private sectors in order to combat identity theft. Specifically, it will bring the Social Security Administration into the 21st century by allowing companies who meet strict regulatory standards to electronically confirm whether a name, date of birth, and Social Security number match.

This will make it much easier for companies, such as credit card issuers, to ensure that they are only providing credit to legitimate applicants. This will prevent millions of dollars in fraud costs, not to mention preventing all of the headaches for my constituents who are victims of identity theft.

I want to encourage all of my colleagues to vote in support of the
Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have no further requests for time, so I am going to move ahead and close.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have seen much agreement on the floor today, pleasantly so. I really don’t know when I have seen as much agreement on a group of bills and legislation as I have seen this day. And I guess it really means that all of us agree that we need to do everything that we can to protect ourselves from identity theft, that we need to look after the interest of children and protect them.

I want to thank all of the staff from both sides of the aisle, even those who worked for subcommittees, as well as for the primary staff, for the tremendous amount of work that they have done.

Again, it is a pleasure working with Mr. CURBelo, and I guess if we don’t agree on everything, we do agree that all of us have a responsibility to file and pay income taxes in order to keep our government moving.

It has been a pleasant day, not just for us, but I think all of our constituents, who have watched the proceedings, probably are saying to themselves that they would love to see more days like this, and I would, too. So I urge passage of this bill and the others that we have before us.

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

Mr. CURBelo of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague, Mr. Davis, and I agree with him. This is certainly something to celebrate. The American people oftentimes see us arguing. It is less often that they see us collaborating and working together to advance policies that will improve quality of life in our country.

That is why I want to again urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5192, the Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act. We need to do everything we can to safeguard our communities from these fraud schemes. This problem has worsened significantly over the past few years and is leaving families with debt they did not accrue and a weaker credit history.

H.R. 5192 will help root out synthetic identity theft through modernized verification of customer information, and I hope my colleagues will join me in voting to help protect individuals across the country from this illegal activity.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, my appreciatio to Chairman BRADY, to Ranking Member NEAL, to Mr. Davis, to Mr. HULTGREN, to Ms. SINEMA, and to everyone who has been a part of making this happen, so that, after we pass this legislation, children in our country won’t have to worry about having their identities stolen at such a young age.

This kind of fraud can really ruin people’s lives, and today, we are working together, as one united House, Repubs and Democrats, to fight fraud and to protect children, some of the most vulnerable people in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 830, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Mr. CURBelo of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and passed.

Pursuant to House Resolution 830, the previous question is ordered on the passage of the bill.
Ms. McCOLLUM and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”
So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
Stated for:
Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 142.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 833
Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:
(1) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Ms. Velázquez.
(2) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Lamb (to rank immediately after Ms. Rosen).
(3) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS.—Mr. Lamb (to rank immediately after Mr. Cortez).

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 141

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 141, a bill originally introduced by Representative Conyers of Michigan, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprints pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?
There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL SERVICE AND THE NATIONAL HONOR GUARD AND PIPE BAND EXHIBITION

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 115, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?
There was no objection.

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

H. Con. Res. 115
Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),
SEC. 1. USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL SERVICE.
(a) IN GENERAL.—The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 37th Annual National Peace Officers Memorial Service (in this resolution referred to as the “Memorial Service”), on the Capitol Grounds, in honor to honor the law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2017.
(b) DATE OF MEMORIAL SERVICE.—The Memorial Service shall be held on May 15, 2018, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate, with preparation for the event to begin on May 11, 2018, and takendum completed on May 16, 2018.

SEC. 2. USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL HONOR GUARD AND PIPE BAND EXHIBITION.
(a) IN GENERAL.—The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition (in this resolution referred to as the “Exhibition”), on the Capitol Grounds, in order to allow law enforcement representatives to exhibit their ability to demonstrate Honor Guard programs and provide for a bagpipe exhibition.
(b) DATE OF EXHIBITION.—The Exhibition shall be held on May 14, 2018, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 3. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—
(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and
(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.
(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsors of the Memorial Service and Exhibition shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the events.

SEC. 4. EVENT PREPARATIONS.
Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsors referred to in section 3(b) are authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds, or upon the stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the Memorial Service and Exhibition.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.
The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the events.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 2018, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCE EMMANUEL MACRON, PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, April 25, 2018, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Emmanuel Macron, President of the French Republic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?
There was no objection.

MAKE THE BAN ON DRILLING PERMANENT

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

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the eighth anniversary of the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the central Gulf of Mexico.

Accordingly, I rise today to, once again, vigorously oppose any effort to allow energy exploration in the eastern gulf. The ban on drilling east of the Military Mission Line, 86 degrees, 41 minutes west, was put in place in 2006 and is going to expire in 2022. We need to make it permanent.

Our tourism industry in Florida and our residential development need protection from offshore drilling. We need protection from the oil companies.

Another spill like Deepwater Horizon would be an existential threat to Florida. The clockwise loop current, which runs all down the west coast, would carry any chemicals that get into the water all down the west coast to Key West.

We don’t need the eastern Gulf to become self-sufficient in energy, either. Technology and the shale revolution have taken care of that.

The Western Hemisphere is already independent and the U.S. itself will be before long. It is estimated that the U.S. will supply 30 percent of Mexico’s gas by 2030. In the Permian Basin alone, one of the three producing sands is estimated to hold over 20 billion barrels of oil equivalence.

As the CEO of Shell said recently: We will see peak demand for gasoline and oil within the decade.

Shell’s latest offshore platform, the Vito, has been scaled back 80 percent from 40,000 tons to 8,900 tons because it is just not productive. Shell is investing in alternative energies.

Mr. Speaker, please protect Florida and make the ban permanent.
TRUMP ADMINISTRATION WEAKENS CLEAN AIR PROTECTIONS

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

Mr. McEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned by the administration’s continued assault on essential regulations that protect our health and our environment.

All Americans need, deserve, and have a right to breathe clean air. Historically, we have upheld that right to reasonable, science-based limits on pollution, but that tradition is under assault.

Last week, the administration directed the EPA to weaken the standards for ambient air pollution.

By allowing for emissions trading, this directive will magnify existing environmental injustices, enabling increased pollution in communities that already live with dangerously high concentrations.

The order also softens public health mandates under the Clean Air Act. It restricts what kind of scientific data regulators can use, and it increases their workloads without providing new resources.

Mr. Speaker, if we ignore the best available science or if we starve agencies of the resources they need to actually uphold commonsense limits, then we are not protecting the American people.

Last week’s directive was dangerous and a needless mistake. Like the rest of this administration’s dirty energy agenda, it needs to be reversed.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LINDA LAMBOURNE

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

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Linda Lambourne, a loving wife, compassionate mother, dedicated public servant, and a pillar in the community of Santa Clarita.

Linda served this esteemed body as an aide to my predecessor, Congressman Buck McKeon. She later continued her public service in the office of my dear friend, California State senator, Scott Wilk.

Her energy, kindness, and commitment to the people of her community was felt by everyone who had the privilege of meeting her. Linda was deeply admired and loved by her family and the people of Santa Clarita.

Mr. Speaker, although she was diagnosed with ALS nearly 3 years ago, Linda never lost her vibrant spirit, as her memory continues, to this day, to be a light in our community.

She is survived by her husband, Steve; her two daughters, Lindsey and Angie; and her five grandchildren. While California may have lost a dear friend with her passing, her joy and wealth of kindness will continue to spread from everyone she touched.

May God bless her and her family, and may she rest in peace.

TAX DAY 2018

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, as Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes put it: “Taxes are the price we pay for a civilized society.”

I rise today because, with the enactment of the Republican tax bill, the American people have been getting the short end of that deal.

When the majority jammed through their tax bill, we all knew it was a massive giveaway to the super-wealthy and the well-connected.

Now, we see the evidence, tax day. The vast majority of tax cuts have gone to stock buybacks, dividends, and corporate mergers, while only a sliver of the benefits found their way to American workers.

On top of that, it will be ordinary Americans and our children and grandchildren who will shoulder the trillions of dollars of debt and threats to cut the very Federal programs that help them and their families make ends meet.

Americans deserve better than the Republican tax bill, massive debt, and never-ending dysfunction. They deserve better jobs, better wages, and a better future.

RECOGNIZING THE LEGACY OF HAROLD “HAL” SNOPEK

(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 legacy of Harold “Hal” Snopek of Binghamton, New York. Mr. Hal Snopek was the beloved Chenango town supervisor and, sadly, passed away last month. Hal graduated from Chenango Forks High School, where he was a multiyear letterman, setting several school records, one which still stands today. He was inducted into the New York State Public High School Hall of Fame Athletic Association in 1991.

Hal was also a devoted car salesman at JW Greene for over 25 years. He was appointed to the Chenango town board in 2004, and served as the town’s current supervisor.

Hal was deeply devoted to his family, leaving behind his loving wife and high school sweetheart, Donna, his daughters, Tami and Tina, four grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren.

Along with being a dedicated public servant, Hal was a loving husband, dad, grandfather, and “Pop Pop.” He was a parishioner at the former St. Christopher’s Church, where he and Donna were married 57 years ago, and he was currently active at Most Holy Rosary.

In his later years, Hal enjoyed driving all over town with his wife, Donna, in his 1932 Chevy. He was known as a Mr. Fix-It and loved to work on cars.

Hal was also known for his warm heart and great sense of humor.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Hal’s contributions to the town of Chenango over the past two decades. Our deepest condolences to Hal’s family on the loss of an honored and beloved member of our community.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS (RETIRED) ROY F. TACHIAS

(Mr. BEN RAY LNJAN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LNJAN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great New Mexican and American hero, Sergeant First Class Roy Tachias of Albuquerque, who is here with us today.

In 1950, Roy Tachias was deployed to Korea, where he saw fierce combat. One night, Roy was ordered to mount a forward listening post. That night, in darkness, he witnessed the Chinese Army approaching. Alone, Roy began to shout, shoot, and throw grenades at the waves of soldiers. This threw the enemy into disarray and stopped the attack.

By morning, Sergeant Tachias had single-handedly killed 33 enemy soldiers and taken one prisoner. He earned the Silver Star for conspicuous gallantry and heroism. Stars and Stripes called him the “One Man Army.” Sergeant Tachias was wounded five times in Korea and received the Purple Heart with a Bronze Star with valor.

After the war, Roy married and settled in California. He eventually returned to the Army and served two tours in Vietnam, where his leadership and bravery earned him another Bronze Star. In 1976, he retired and returned home to New Mexico.

It is with great gratitude, pride, and respect that we recognize his service today. New Mexico is humbled by his lifetime of service that began on the Korean Peninsula in 1950, and has continued to inspire those around him.

RECOGNIZING THE SYLVESTER COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CENTER

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center at my alma mater, the University of Miami. Sylvester is the only university-based cancer center in South Florida. With locations from Miami to Coral Springs, it serves one of the most diverse regions in the nation.

We are lucky to have Sylvester because, unfortunately, Florida has the second highest rate of cancer in the country. This is why, every day, more
than 250 doctors and scientists at Sylvester work tirelessly to discover exciting breakthroughs and lead the search to find a cure for cancer.

Sylvester is also committed to increasing access to prevention and early detection for South Florida’s most vulnerable and high-risk communities. The center will soon be launching a cutting-edge mobile screening unit to serve thousands throughout South Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate all of the doctors, the nurses, and the researchers at Sylvester Cancer Center on their amazing success, and thank them for providing highly specialized and unique cancer treatment for all of our South Florida community residents.

RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF RICK ANTLE

(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 the passing of Rick Antle, an absolute legend of the agricultural and culture industry in our Salinas Valley and all across our great Nation.

Rick was the president and CEO of the produce giant, Tanimura & Antle. T&A’s success was due to Rick’s and his family’s stewardship of the environment, as well as his employees. For the farmworkers, who he called the backbone of his business, he provided state-of-the-art healthcare and housing, and invited all of his employees to join a stock option program so that they could become owners of the company. The way he ran T&A was a testament to his caring personality and his political philosophy.

Yet, for Rick, nothing was more important than family. A beloved son, a devoted husband and soulmate to his wife, Tonya, a doting grandfather, and a dedicated father, Rick’s love for his family, generosity to his employees, and contributions to the agriculture community and to our community will never be forgotten.

That is why I will never forget his son, Brian, recounting the best piece of advice Rick ever gave him, which was that “the best fertilizer a farmer can ever use is his shadow.” To me, that philosophy sums up Rick and the Antle family, and that is why he will always be there, and that is why Rick Antle will always be with us.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MAYOR RONNIE E. JACOBS

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Nahunata mayor, Ronnie E. Jacobs, who passed away on Thursday, March 29, at the age of 64. Mayor Jacobs had been the mayor of Nahunata, Georgia, in Georgia’s First Congressional District, for over 15 years and across four different decades.

Mayor Jacobs lived in Nahunata for his entire life, taking great pride in his town, and truly caring about its residents and well-being. A testament to his hard work for the well-being of Nahunata, Mayor Jacobs founded Neighbors Helping Neighbors there in 2004, which is a nonprofit that helps citizens search for jobs, purchase homes, apply for nutrition assistance, and much more.

Mayor Jacobs has also done an exceptional job guiding his residents through unique situations for Nahunata, including population changes, hurricanes, and wildfires.

Mayor Jacobs will be remembered by many in Nahunata as one of the best leaders the city has ever had. His family and the city of Nahunata are in my thoughts and prayers.

SEVERE RAIN AND FLOODING IN KAUAI AND EAST OAHU

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD, to call attention to the damage done by severe rain and flooding on the island of Kauai and in East Oahu.

It was an unexpected spring storm and, according to the National Weather Service, the town of Hanalei received more than 27 inches of rain over the weekend. Hanalei is home to my very good friends, the Haraguchis. Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, there are no reports of injuries, and for that we are lucky and grateful. However, the images of mudslides, mangled roadways, and severely damaged homes is heartbreaking. It is encouraging to see the community come together to share food, electricity, and water.

Kauai suffered a direct hit from a hurricane about 30 years ago, and it is the wettest place on planet Earth. Yet, their mayor, Bernard Carvalho, who was born and raised on the island, declared the disaster “the worst.”

On Oahu, there was a 24-hour rainfall from 4 p.m. Friday to 4 p.m. Saturday, more rain fell in Niu Valley in one day than in all of April 2017. Flooding closed a major highway, filled homes with waist-deep water, and washed debris out to sea.

FEMA is working with State and county officials and is prepared to initiate Federal assistance the moment the Governor asks for it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and extend the biodiesel and renewable diesel tax incentives to the end of this year, and work with me and others, in a bipartisan way, to find a more permanent solution to this system of irresponsible stopgap tax extensions.

GOP TAX SCAM

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as certain as March 20 is the first day of spring, today, April 17, at midnight, is the tax filing deadline for 2017 returns. Months after passing the $1.8 trillion deficit-busting tax giveaway, Republicans are still trying to sell their trickle-down tax scam.

In fact, Republicans are so desperate to spin the tax scam that a GOP-sanctioned PAC group will spend $1 million on TV ads to convince us of what we know isn’t true. The American people aren’t buying it.

Republicans’ huge tax bonanzas to corporations and billionaires is not trickling down to the American people. It is billions of dollars in tax giveaways to major corporations, but 12 cents to the average worker.

Instead of stuffing the tax scam with corporate giveaways, we should have closed the carried interest loophole, one of many promises President Trump made during his campaign and then broke. That loophole lets hedge fund managers pay a 20 percent tax on their investment profits, while the 37 percent individual income tax.

The Republican tax plan is pure greed, and we should reverse it at our first opportunity.
Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Calla Medig.

Going to the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas had become an annual tradition for Calla. She would always take time off from her job as a waitress in Edmonton, Canada, so she could travel to Las Vegas just for the festival.

Calla was a hard worker and was about to become the newest manager at her restaurant. She was a mature, grounded, and lighthearted person.

Calla will be remembered for being kind and warmhearted and for being someone who would always greet you with a beaming smile. She was a kitchen helper and was about to become the newest manager at her restaurant. She was a mature, grounded, and lighthearted person.

I extend my condolences to Calla Medig’s family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.
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She was outspoken, and she said what was on her mind, and she knew more things than many of us have forgotten. She knew them, and she remembered them, and she would always have a little quip or a little thing to say that would really make you laugh and would make you feel like you were with a friend. And she kind of gave you the inside scoop on a bunch of things.

You know, she was the Member of Congress who was the oldest Member of Congress, and you would never know it. When you would find out how old she was, I thought it was a misprint. She was always young. Until the day she died, she was young, young and having a passion and a belief of helping people and having a belief in government and government was there to do good for people and to be a good tool, not, as some people would say, that government is the enemy.

Louise always believed that government should be and could be and would be a tool to do things for people, for seniors, for poor people, for immigrants. If you needed someone to come and help you work for any cause that was a right cause, all you had to do was ask Louise, and she always said yes.

Now, our offices back in the Rayburn building are opposite each other. So you go down the hallway. If you turn left, you are in my office; if you turn right, you are in her office. So I often got to meet her when we were going to vote, and sometimes they said things to her about New York politics, and she really had the in, the scoop. She really knew what it was.

I am going to miss her. I already miss her. I know we have so many of our colleagues from New York who are here because all of us together have a heartfelt appreciation of what it was to be Louise and to be Louise’s friend.

You know that twang she had from Kentucky? She always proudly told everyone she was from Kentucky, but her heart was really from New York, and I will miss her dearly.

Rest peacefully, my friend. We all love you.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York’s Seventeenth Congressional District (Ms. VELAZQUEZ).

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me, and thank my friends for organizing this tribute.

Louise was a remarkable woman, an astute legislator, a skilled negotiator, and a gifted debater. She will be remembered for all those traits. But she will also be remembered for her home passion, her humor, and the many kindnesses she extended to all of us. I will always recall the many times coming down to this very floor to speak and hearing Louise arguing for fairness and opposing policies bad for our country. She was a fierce orator with a sharp wit. When she disagreed with how this House was doing business, she let it be known.

She was a passionate voice for progressive values. Like a New Yorker, she never backed down from a fight. If she wanted to get something done, she dug in her heels and fought like hell for it.

But, as a daughter of the South, she will equally be remembered for her amazing wit, her gentle touch, her disarming smile, and her genuine friendships on both sides of the aisle.

What is remarkable is that, at the end of the day, when the debate concluded, Louise was known for sharing a laugh with her colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle.

Someone once described her as “a combination of Southern charm and backroom politics, a Southern belle with a cigar in her mouth.” She truly was larger than life.

When Louise came to Congress, there were far fewer women in this body. She helped lead the way for so many of us who came after, breaking down barriers. So many of us owe her a debt of gratitude for the trails she blazed.

As a fellow New Yorker, as a female Member of Congress, but most of all, as her friend, I know I will miss her.

This body is better served for her service, and the U.S. House will certainly be a less colorful place without seeing her on the floor, leading debates on the rules with her Kentucky accent and her commitment to progressive values.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York’s Seventeenth Congressional District (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation still grieves the loss of a great New Yorker, Louise Slaughter.

I will never forget when Louise and I, still just junior Congresswomen at the time, charged up the steps of the U.S. Senate and demanded that Anita Hill be allowed to testify against Clarence Thomas.

Louise never lost that fighting spirit, fearlessness, and commitment to justice, equality, and women’s rights.

She broke barriers, becoming the first woman to chair the House Rules Committee, and set a strong example of public service and principled leadership as dean of the New York congressional delegation.

As a leading champion of women’s empowerment, she proudly represented Seneca Falls, the site of the first woman’s rights convention, and the votes were taken on the floor for the Equal Rights Amendment.

As a fellow New Yorker, as a fellow New Yorker, Louise Slaughter’s family and the legions of staff who served her may find comfort knowing her great legacy and many accomplishments have improved the lives of so many Americans.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York’s Thirteenth Congressional District (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), from New York’s 12th Congressional District.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his incredible leadership in supporting Louise, her colleagues, and organizing this tribute to her tonight.

No one was a better public servant or fighter for her constituents than Louise Slaughter. Her passing is a huge loss for New York, for the House, and for all of us. She worked for people right up until the day she died. When I first came to Congress, Louise took me under her wing. For that, and her friendship, I will be forever grateful.

As a daughter of the South, she was the Member of Congress of the generation that fought and worked so hard to end Jim Crow, and to be Louise’s friend.

While I could go on and on about her legislative achievements, including the Violence Against Women Act—the first bill that I worked on when I came to Congress with Louise—she was the lead Democrat along with then-Senator Biden. It was a transformational bill that addressed violence against women. She fought years for it. Many people thought it was a personal affair, a family affair, and she fought to making it a legal affair that women should be protected in any and every circumstance. It had money in it to train police and prosecutors to be more sensitive to the needs of women and the violence against them.

She was a biologist by training and was very proud of this background. She was a leader on FDA health issues and was the first to introduce genetic information and the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act that became a central part of the Affordable Care Act, that you should not hold preexisting conditions and prevent healthcare for people because of preexisting conditions.

I have no doubt that her leadership and the example she set as the first female chair of the House Rules Committee led to more women running for office. She was a trailblazer, and she broke down doors for people, for women, and for real change in this country.
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She was a leader for New York, and she was a leader for Democrats in New York. She was one of the first Democrats to be elected in upstate New York, and everyone running for office in upstate New York, the first person they went to was Louise Slaughter. I am proud to have called her a dear friend and a beloved colleague. I stand grateful and able to pay tribute to her and to say thank you to her and her family. She adored her late husband, Bob, and we all appreciate the great impact she had on me, on this Congress, and on our Nation.

Louise, we miss you. You are in our hearts. Thank you, dear friend.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Representative YVETTE CLARKE of New York’s Ninth Congressional District.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative TONKO for leading this Special Order hour in commemoration of our dear colleague, the Honorable Louise Slaughter.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on the floor today to honor a remarkable woman. Words just couldn’t adequately capture the sense of sadness I felt after hearing of the loss of Congresswoman Louise Slaughter, the dean of the New York delegation.

Louise dedicated her life’s work to the people of western New York and, indeed, all Americans across our great Nation. She embodied a spirit of strength, wisdom, and grace, and she was beautiful inside and out. She represented the very best of the American spirit, our values, and our ideals.

Louise was a trailblazer and was the first woman to serve as chair and ranking member of the powerful House Rules Committee. She commanded the respect and admiration of all of her colleagues. Having had the honor of serving with Louise has enriched my passion for service and my commitment to fight for the most vulnerable amongst us.

Louise was indeed a woman on whose shoulders I stand. The United States Congress has lost an esteemed leader, the New York delegation has lost a beloved dean, and I have lost a cherished friend and mentor.

It is an honor and privilege to serve with Louise Slaughter, and she is missed immensely.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) from New York’s 10th Congressional District.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am heartbroken at the loss of Louise Slaughter, who was a dear friend and a beloved colleague. I first met Louise when she was elected to the New York State Assembly in 1982, and ELIOT ENGEL and Louise Slaughter and I sat next to each other on the Assembly floor. She was only with us in the Assembly for 4 years and then she came here. I trailed her by another 6 years.

She was always a champion of upstate New York, which caused people to do a double take when they heard her southern lilt. She was a champion for the people of her state for 50 years.

She was a champion for women’s rights. She was a passionate leader as co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus for many years. She protected the freedom of every woman to live, work, and start a family on her own terms.

She was, as you have heard, the chairman at one point, the leading Democrat on the House Rules Committee. She was tough, determined, and compassionate, and she was a fighter. She was a fighter for the vulnerable and those without a voice.

She was a microbiologist before she came into politics. And she left a lasting imprint of that with her Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act which was one of the greatest accomplishments in my time in Congress. She wrote the STOCK Act, to prohibit Congress Members from trading on inside knowledge, which not only was important to integrity, but it was the ability to deal with the genomics. She understood before anybody else the potential for good and for bad, and she wrote and eventually got into law the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act.

People wouldn’t be discriminated against on the basis of their genetic traits.

She wrote the STOCK Act, to prohibit Congress Members from trading on inside knowledge, which not only was important to integrity, but it was the ability to deal with the genomics. She understood before anybody else the potential for good and for bad, and she wrote and eventually got into law the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act.

People wouldn’t be discriminated against on the basis of their genetic traits.

When she ran for Congress the first time, she ran against an incumbent who, being in the minority party at that time, was in the habit of voting “no” on a lot of things. And she labeled him in the campaign as the “Abominable Member of Congress” who, in her words, didn’t have a great sense of humor which other people appreciated, and she will long be remembered for her sense of humor, for her decency, her humanity, and her tireless, fearless work for everyone.

The Halls of the Capitol feel diminished without her. And I have realized over the last few weeks how lucky we all were to know her, to work with her, to call her a friend. We will always miss her, and this institution will be diminished by her absence.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative JOHN KATKO from New York’s 24th Congressional District.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute in honor of the life of one of my dear friends and colleagues, Representative Dorothy Louise McIntosh Slaughter.

Congresswoman Slaughter passed away last month at the age of 88 after more than 31 years of service in the House of Representatives representing the people of Rochester, New York. Born a coal miner’s daughter from Kentucky, Louise quickly became a true native daughter of upstate New York, exemplifying its values and representing her fellow constituents with the zeal and tenacity that was unrivaled in her storied tenure.

Becoming the first woman to chair the House Rules Committee, Congresswoman Slaughter was a pioneer in her advocacy for issues ranging from congressional transparency to health protections for those with preexisting conditions.

A true native daughter of upstate New York, Louise has a family on her own terms.

But she was more than just her legislative accomplishments. She was a passionate leader as a member of the Pro-Choice Caucus for many years. She protected the freedom of every woman to live, work, and start a family on her own terms.

She was as you have heard, the chairman at one point, the leading Democrat on the House Rules Committee. She was tough, determined, and compassionate, and she was a fighter. She was a fighter for the vulnerable and those without a voice.

She was a microbiologist before she came into politics. And she left a lasting imprint of that with her Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act which was one of the greatest accomplishments in my time in Congress. She wrote the STOCK Act, to prohibit Congress Members from trading on inside knowledge, which not only was important to integrity, but it was the ability to deal with the genomics. She understood before anybody else the potential for good and for bad, and she wrote and eventually got into law the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act.

People wouldn’t be discriminated against on the basis of their genetic traits.

Rest peacefully, Louise. I will miss you, your family demeanor and your wonderful smile.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Representative JOHN LEWIS, who represents Georgia’s Fifth Congressional District.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Brother PAUL, for yielding.

It is hard. It is difficult to stand here and know that Sister Louise Slaughter is not here. We came to Congress together, and, from time to time, she would call me Brother JOHN. I loved Sister Louise.

She would talk. She would laugh. She was smart, gifted, and brave. She was courageous and sometimes very bold. I would always remember the true meaning of bipartisanship, readily reaching across the aisle to people like me, in spite of party or public pressure, to achieve the common good.

Rest peacefully, Louise. I will miss your simple demeanor and your wonderful smile.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Brother JOHN for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Representative NANCY PELOSI from California, our former Speaker, our Democratic leader, our minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I think this may have happened to me at the funeral as well when I followed John Lewis to the podium. What a task. I thank the gentleman for being such an inspiration and thank him for loving Louise so much as we know she loved Brother JOHN as well.

Aren’t we proud of PAUL TONKO and his relationship with Louise, a friendship that goes back to the State Legislature many years ago in New York.

Louise came 31 years ago to the Congress.
friendship goes back longer. So dear
she was to her.

So here we have Louise—and I don’t
have a magic minute, so this is not an
8-hour proposition in high heels, al-
though I would love to do that for Lou-
ise any time—but let me just make
some wishes. I wish you could have all
been in Rochester for Louise’s memo-
rial service to hear her grandchildren
talk about her.

She was a grandmother myself, and
time I go to a service now, I think:
What do the grandchildren think? What
do they know about their grand-
mother? Do they know how much their
grandmother loved them? Louise’s grandchildren did tell. Hopefully we
will be hearing more from them.

□ 1845
They spoke magnificently about her
personally—not so great about her
cooking, not that day anyway. But,
anyway, they just loved her so much.

She was about the future, but she had
terrible respect for the past as well.

When you had one of our heroes, Bro-
der John, visit her in Rochester, we
would go to Susan B. Anthony’s home
to see where so much of women’s rights
began. She would take us across the
borderline of the district to see where
it all began at Seneca Falls. She took
such ownership of our suffragettes and
her responsibility to carry forth their
courage and their possibilities for the
future.

She was a Southern belle with a
Southern charm and a Northern time-
able. So you never wanted to waste
too much time not giving in to Louise
because eventually she would have her
way. Save yourself some time: What-
ever you say, Louise

She was a beautiful person to serve
with. Many of our colleagues want to
speak about her. I will have another
opportunity tomorrow, but I did want
to add my voice, once again, to our col-
leagues*, as we speak about her with
great respect, admiration, and affec-
tion. She was about the future, but she had

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to
the gentlewoman from California (Ms.
ESHOO). Representative ANNA ESHOO
represents the 18th District.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank our
colleague and dear friend, PAUL TONKO,
for organizing this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, to all of Congress-
woman Slaughter’s staff that is here,
we pay tribute to them. She loved them,
and she would talk about each one of them. I don’t know which one is
which, but she thought that we all
knew which one was which. She had all
the stories straight. She was so proud
of them.

There is so much to be said about
Louise. She was a great mother. She
was a fabulous wife to Bob. She was a
microbiologist. She was a great grand-
mother. She represented a district in
western New York with a Kentucky ac-
cent. I don’t think that will ever hap-
pen again.

She had a beautiful singing voice. I
don’t know how many Members know

that. When our country was attacked
and the Congress went out in front of
the Capitol, it was Congresswoman
Slaughter who started singing “God
Bless America,” and everyone joined in
on that.

She was not only proud to represent
the home of the feminists, those revo-
 lutionaries, she was one herself, and
she was damn proud of it. She wasn’t
an apologist for any of it. She was
proud of it because she understood that
that was what was going to move
America forward.

She loved this House. She had a
home on the Hill, and she had a home in
her district, but she loved this House. She
used to stand right here. This is where
she did her work.

Mr. Speaker, don’t cross Louise.
Don’t ever cross Louise. She was a
lady, but I will tell you something, you
would feel the wrath of Louise Slaugh-
ter if you went the other way on her.

The way I will always remember Lou-
ise is the way she would talk about you.
She knew how to love well. She had a
fierceness about her in taking care of
her constituents. They belonged to her,
and she belonged to them. As the lead-
er recalled, the tribute they paid to her
at her memorial I think was second to
none.

So, Louise, my friend, no one is ever
going to fill your shoes around here,
but we stand taller because we knew

She showed us the right way to be a
friend, the best way to represent peo-
ple, and how to fight tough and fight
hard for the right things.

I loved Louise’s accent. When you
would see her on the floor, she would
say: ANNA, have I told you this week
that I just love you?

When she spoke, it was as if her
words were just a security blanket
around you. You knew that she meant
it. It was tender, it was loving, and you
knew that you had one of the best part-
ners you could ever have in any under-
taking.

I think that Louise is very happy in
heaven. I have no doubt that she is
chairing the big Rules Committee in
the sky. I have no doubt that when she
got to the gate, there was absolutely
no discussion whatsoever as to whether
she was going to take a high place in
heaven because of everything that she
did on Earth.

So, Louise, be happy there. You
earned it.

We miss her here, but we know that
her spirit is with us, it always will be,
and that we will love her across eter-
nity.

There was a poet that wrote these be-
autiful words: So she passed over, and all the
trumpets sounded for her on the other side.

God rest you, Louise.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to
the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAP-
 TUR). Congresswoman MARCY KAP'TUR
represents Ohio’s Ninth District.

Ms. KAP'TUR. Mr. Speaker, what a
privilege it is to be with our colleagues
tonight to join together to pay tribute
to our friend, Louise McIntosh Slaugh-
ter, born in Harlan County, Kentucky,
who wrote fresh pages in American his-
tory.

There ought to be a statue at Seneca
Falls that honors her service to Amer-
ica, and it was astounding.

She became one of only 288 women in
American history to be elected to this
House of Representatives, and she, as
with all women Members who have
served as House Members, was vividly
aware she was an American pioneer, as
only 3 percent of individuals who have
ever served here to date have been
women.

What a marvelous person she was to
be with. We had the privilege of serving
together for over three decades. Her
acuity, her passion, her perseverance,
and her sparkling humor and keen
mind brought new life and direction to
our republic and to every Member here.

She was a treasured friend and, yes,
dean of the New York delegation. She
also became the first woman to ever
chair the exclusive Rules Committee, a
committee whose unusually round-the-
clock schedule required members to
work through the night and into the
wee hours of the morning, often past
midnight, or convene at the crack of
dawn. It wasn’t an easy job. That com-
mittee is a place of grueling endurance,
and yet she traversed that brutal track
day in and day out without a whimper.

How she could remain crisp on sub-
sequent day floor debates and hundreds
of bills and amendments managing thousands of details is a
vivid testimony to her mental and
physical strength which she devoted to
our Nation.

She was gracious to a fault. I recall
her inviting Members to her Rules
Committee office always helping Mem-
bers to feel at home here.

As the eldest woman in the House
with 88 years of experience, Louise
Slaughter brought from that revered
America superbly. She was dedicated
to the working people of our country
and to the rights of women. She never
stopped giving.

The daughter of a blacksmith who
worked in a Kentucky coal mine, she
was a tireless advocate for workers in
Rochester in places like Kodak or
Xerox, and she stood shoulder to shoul-
der with her community and fought
with full soul against bad trade deals
that would cruelly and unfairly crush
their hard work. She was an apologist
for any of it. She was

She coauthored the Violence Against
Women Act and fought full bore for
equal pay for equal work and stood tall
for equal rights for all. She never
stopped giving.

Last night, I attended an event at the
United States Holocaust Memorial Mu-
seum, and one of the women docents
told me that she loved her job and said,
I told her what happened to Louise, and she said: Oh, my
goodness, I am from upstate New York.
I was her constituent. She gave me a
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and her life.

for always sitting with her and for en-

liberty, she has helped make America a

work for America and commitment to

years, and her beautiful daughters,

Slaughter and her husband, Bob, who

are doing now, a very high-level person at

committee, I learned fast from her. I can-

cannot forget the time teaching a

the Rules Committee and how to do it

right.

She never lost her humor and her

wonderful Southern twang. Of course,

who would be better leading Seneca Falls than Louise McIntosh Slaughter?

I thank her for her fight for women’s rights and as well for taking me to Ni-

agara Falls as a member of the Home-

land Security Committee.

So, finally, as I close, I am reminded

that Congresswoman Slaughter had an

iron fist in a velvet glove, and I loved

it, I loved her wit, and I loved the fact

that she was a true American.

So my prayer is that the Lord bring

comfort to the many people, those who

Louise knew and those who felt they

knew Louise Slaughter, who know that

a mighty oak has fallen and are heart-

broken at her loss. I ask that God bless

her, may God rest her, and as well may

God bless her constituents as God blesses the United States of America.

Farewell, Congresswoman Louise

McIntosh Slaughter, you will never be

forgotten, and you will always be re-

membered.

I want to thank my colleague PAUL TONKO,

for organizing this session honoring our

shared friend.

I rise today in remembrance of my dear

friend and our beloved colleague, Congress-

woman Louise McIntosh Slaughter of New

York, a trailblazer for women, whose powerful

voice was quieted this past March 16, 2018.

Louise Slaughter lived a long, full, and con-

sequential life and got the most out of the 88

years she graced this world.

She will be remembered in this House for

her service to her constituents and her col-

leagues, her formidable intellect, her mastery of

the legislative process, and her gracious-

ness and kindness to all who came in contact

with her.

After serving four years in the New

York State Assembly, Louise Slaughter was elected to the

100th Congress in 1986 to represent

the 30th Congressional District of New

York, most of eastern Monroe

County, all of Genesee County and northern

Livingston and Ontario counties.

Recalled to the 15 succeeding Congresses

Louise Slaughter carved out a legacy of lead-

ership and accomplishments in the areas of

women’s rights and empowerment, the arts,

health care, battlefield preparedness, eco-

nomic revitalization, the environment, and so-

cial justice.

Born in the coal mining town of Lynch, Ken-

tucky where she earned degrees in microbi-

ology and public health, Louise Slaughter un-

derstood the connection between public health and a vibrant democracy, and fought to en-

sure passage of the landmark Affordable Care

Act.

In the 112th Congress, Congresswoman Louise Slaughter introduced and shepherded to passage Pub. L. 112–105, the “Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act” or “STOCK Act,” which prohibits the use of non-

public information for private profit, including insider trading by members of Congress and other government employees, and requires many financial transactions by members of Congress to be reported within 45 days.

Mr. Speaker, since her first years on Capitol Hill, Congresswoman Louise Slaughter was an advocate for women all over the world.

Among her many accomplishments, Congresswoman Louise Slaughter co-authored the landmark Violence Against Women Act, en-

sured the first federal funding to the National Institutes of Health to research breast cancer, and was a co-founder of the Congressional Pro-Choice Caucus.

It is particularly fitting and altogether appro-

priate that this tireless champion of women, children, and families represented an area near Seneca Falls, the location of the first women’s rights convention in 1848.

The dean of New York’s Congressional De-

legation, Louise Slaughter was the first woman to chair the powerful House Rules Committee, and the first woman to serve as Ranking Member of that Committee, and in both roles she carried the banner and led the fight for progressive values and to make our good country better.

I will always remember and be grateful to Congresswoman Louise Slaughter for her help in my duties representing the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

I worked closely with Congresswoman Lou-

ise Slaughter and drew upon her counsel and assistance to shepherd scores of bills and amendments to passage that have been bene-

ficial to my constituents.

For Louise Slaughter was incredibly generous with her knowledge and experience and served as a mentor to new members of Con-

gress, including me.

I will never forget that Louise Slaughter’s advocacy continued until her last days with us, including National Women’s March in Wash-


Mr. Speaker, Louise Slaughter was an iron

fist in a velvet glove.

A native of Kentucky, Louise Slaughter

never lost her Southern twang and charm.

Louise Slaughter effortlessly mixed humor with logic to win over skeptics.

And then after disarming you, Louise Slaughter made her move.

Through her words and deeds, Louise Slaughter worked to make the lives of all Americans better.

Louise Slaughter was a dear friend and her loss leaves a void in my heart.

It is my prayer that the Lord brings comfort to the many people—those whom Louise knew and those whom Louise Slaughter—who know that a mighty oak has fallen and are heartbroken at the loss.

I thank her family for sharing her with us and the country.
Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative BARBARA LEE of California's 13th District.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank Congressman TONKO for leading this important hour in memory of our beloved friend and colleague, Congresswoman Louise Slaughter. Every time I walk on this floor, I still look for Louise. Actually, PAUL, right there. The void that she has left is just unbearable.

Her passing was devastating news for all of us here, but I must once again send my thoughts and condolences to her beautiful daughters, her grandchildren, to her entire congressional district, the State of New York, and really, to our entire country.

Louise was a dear friend and mentor, and she was an unparalleled legislator. Of course, she loved her district and she was an unparalleled legislator. Finally, let me just say I not only lost a colleague, but also a dear friend. My prayers are with her family and friends, her staff, her district. Louise will have a lasting place in history, though, and her spirit is with us tonight. Still, we miss her and her presence, the light of grace, dignity, intelligence, and she touched and enriched all our lives.

Louise, we will miss you so much. May you rest in peace. May God bless you.

And again, I thank PAUL for this opportunity.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Representative JACQUELINE SPEIER of California's 14th District.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, thank you, and I thank my dear friend, PAUL TONKO, who loved Louise like no one else in this Chamber, for arranging this for us tonight.

Tom Jones had a song, "She's a Lady." Louise Slaughter was that lady, except none of the other lyrics of that song were appropriate for Louise. She was a lady who was tough as nails, with a steel backbone and a sharp and very funny tongue.

There are many people I like in our Chamber, few I truly love. I loved Louise Slaughter.

Members come and go and hardly leave a footprint around here, even in our memories. But Louise left a footprint from the day she stepped into this Chamber to the day she stepped out. She was still fighting for her constituents long after she left this world, no-no. Well, Louise poached one of my staff members, and I told her. And when we talked about it, I said: I am so happy, Louise. You are the only Member that I would be happy about poaching.

And I want to say to Louise's staff how much I know, like ANNA said, that she loved you and she respected you. I have to say, around here poaching is a no-no. Well, Louise poached one of my staff members, and I told her. And when we talked about it, I said: I am so happy, Louise. You are the only Member that I would be happy about poaching.

I also want to say to Louise's staff how much I know, like ANNA said, that she loved you and she respected you. I have to say, around here poaching is a no-no. Well, Louise poached one of my staff members, and I told her. And when we talked about it, I said: I am so happy, Louise. You are the only Member that I would be happy about poaching.

And I want to say to Louise's staff how much I know, like ANNA said, that she loved you and she respected you. I have to say, around here poaching is a no-no. Well, Louise poached one of my staff members, and I told her. And when we talked about it, I said: I am so happy, Louise. You are the only Member that I would be happy about poaching.

I also want to say to Louise's staff how much I know, like ANNA said, that she loved you and she respected you. I have to say, around here poaching is a no-no. Well, Louise poached one of my staff members, and I told her. And when we talked about it, I said: I am so happy, Louise. You are the only Member that I would be happy about poaching.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, thank you, and I thank my dear friend, PAUL TONKO, who loved Louise like no one else in this Chamber, for arranging this for us tonight.

Tom Jones had a song, "She's a Lady." Louise Slaughter was that lady, except none of the other lyrics of that song were appropriate for Louise. She was a lady who was tough as nails, with a steel backbone and a sharp and very funny tongue.

There are many people I like in our Chamber, few I truly love. I loved Louise Slaughter.

Members come and go and hardly leave a footprint around here, even in our memories. But Louise left a footprint from the day she stepped into this Chamber to the day she stepped out. She was still fighting for her constituents long after she left this world, no-no. Well, Louise poached one of my staff members, and I told her. And when we talked about it, I said: I am so happy, Louise. You are the only Member that I would be happy about poaching.

I also want to say to Louise's staff how much I know, like ANNA said, that she loved you and she respected you. I have to say, around here poaching is a no-no. Well, Louise poached one of my staff members, and I told her. And when we talked about it, I said: I am so happy, Louise. You are the only Member that I would be happy about poaching.

And I want to say to Louise's staff how much I know, like ANNA said, that she loved you and she respected you. I have to say, around here poaching is a no-no. Well, Louise poached one of my staff members, and I told her. And when we talked about it, I said: I am so happy, Louise. You are the only Member that I would be happy about poaching.
Mr. TONKO. I thank the Congresswoman for her thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the New Hampshire District One Representative, Congresswoman Carol SHEA-PORTER.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Thank you, Congressman TONKO, for yielding. I know how close you were to Louise and how much she loved you and you loved her.

I offer my condolences not only to Louise’s family, but also to Paul and to the entire Chamber, and to me, because I loved Louise, also. You hear people using the word “love” here. It was very genuine.

When I arrived in January of 2007, I saw the fire in Louise and I saw the honey in Louise. She was a mixture of both. That is what made her so absolutely delightful. I saw her as the new chairman of the Rules Committee take on our friends across the aisle about so many issues here, and she had that fire in her. But then I saw her with the honey and the sweetness, and that is why people use the word “love” when they talk about Louise.

So I want to tell just a very short story about my first real close encounter with Louise Slaughter.

I happened to be in New Hampshire who very much admired Louise and wanted to meet her. I said: She is busy. She has just taken over this new position. And I am new, but okay, I will ask her.

So we were walking there, and I called Louise over, and I said: Louise, I would like to introduce you to somebody who just has always admired you.

Louise said: Honey, have her come into my office.

So we did. And Louise sat down on the couch like she didn’t have a thing to do that day except to entertain us with tea and small talk and just her warmth and her vibrancy. My friend never forgot that. I never forgot that either. Louise, absolutely full of love and, as I said, full of honey and also full of fire.

We miss her very much here. We always will.

Condolences to her staff, who loved her as well, and I know that she loved them. And to the people of western New York, thank you for sharing her with us for so long.

Mr. TONKO. I thank the Congresswoman for those comments.

Mr. Speaker, now we will hear from the gentleman from Texas 35, Congressman LLOYD DOGGETT.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank Mr. Tonko so much for organizing this Special Order. I do know how special that Louise was to you and to so many of us. She was a dear friend for many years, an outspoken advocate for social and economic justice, and she put together a great team, a series of teams through her years here, some of whom are on the floor today. We salute them, also.

Louise was funny, she was sometimes a bit conspiratorial, and she was a person who just refused to act her age in the best ways possible. I was amazed myself, knowing that Louise had been here a few years more than I had, to learn what her age was at the time of her passing, because she was out powerfully speaking truth to power right up until the week before she passed.

She had the enthusiastic support of her late husband and partner, Bob. Both of them understood the challenges of public service, and they withheld repeated Republican assaults with wit and grit. Her fierce passion was matched with sincere compassion and kindness.

Over the years, time and time again, she reached out and helped me and helped other Members. I admired her unwavering commitment to speak truth and to honor values of acceptance, equality, and justice. She put the health and well-being of people first, and she fought tirelessly to improve the lives of the people in her community and across this country.

Louise showed just how much one determined woman can do for our country. As chair of the Rules Committee, she was involved in every major piece of legislation or minor legislation of those that came before this House. And in her service on Rules, it can certainly be said that she worked day and night, sometimes all night, on behalf of the people of this country.

She overcame significant resistance to secure passage of the Violence Against Women Act, achieving some historic increases in funding for women’s health. She was a real trailblazer when it came to so many issues and in support of so many women to get involved and make a difference for our country.

She authored the STOCK Act to ensure more complete and timely disclosure of financial dealings by the Members of this House so that no one was trading off the public trust for private gain.

I think of Louise and look over to this microphone each time a rule is brought up in the House setting forth the terms of debate for legislation. There is a vacancy in our Hearts, and there is a vacancy in our hearts for a tough but generous woman.

We salute her daughters, Megan, Amy, and Emily; her grandchildren; her great-grandchild, all of whom she often referred to and showed such great affection for. May it be a source of comfort for each of them that their mother was a loyal and loving friend, a fierce and genuine public servant, a force to be reckoned with, a champion for so many vital causes; and may her very fiery spirit live on with all of us.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, there you have it, just a few of the colleagues of Louise Slaughter who shared their sentiments. You can tell that she had this lasting touch upon each and every one of us.

We are made better because we crossed paths in life, we travelled journeys together, and she will leave a forever quality in our hearts and our souls. And to our champion, our trailblazer, the true voice for the weak voice or underheard in government, the pioneer expression, the drum major for women, it goes on and on—she earned so many labels—to our friend, Louise Slaughter, our colleague, our mentor, rest in peace, beloved friend.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise by colleague from New York, the former dean of our delegation and the first woman to chair the House Rules Committee, Louise McIntosh Slaughter. Louise was a wonderful soul whose love of public service, the institution of Congress, and her home of western New York each and every day.

Louise grew up in a coal mining community in Kentucky as one of 5 children. Inspired by the loss of her sister to pneumonia as a child, Louise chose to study microbiology and pursue a master’s degree in public health. Her passion for health care inspired her work throughout her career as she championed numerous bills and efforts to help the American people gain real access to care.

After obtaining her green card Louise met her husband, Robert, and the couple moved to New York. While living near Rochester, Louise became involved in local community groups and eventually sought to get involved in electoral politics. Her long career in public service took Louise from the county legislature to Gov. Mario Cuomo’s staff, the New York State Assembly, and eventually the Congress.

I had the honor of serving alongside Louise in the Assembly before eventually joining her in Congress. She had a perfect blend of southern charm and New York hustle, and was a steadfast champion for the people of western New York and Americans across the country. I will miss her relentless passion, her wit, and above all, her friendship. I know Monroe County and the city of Rochester will miss their longtime champion.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Louise Slaughter was a scientist, and she approached her work in this House with scientific precision. She found that special formula for success: mix an extraordinary work ethic with a deep intellect and love for her community, and you get a result that was thirty-one years of excellence serving New Yorkers in Congress. I was deeply saddened to learn of her passing last month, and I will look back fondly on the three decades we served together in this House.

As the daughter of a coal miner blacksmith, Louise grew up around hardship and challenge. Later, as a microbiologist and an elected official, she made public health and economic opportunity her focus. In Congress, she fought for funding for what keeps our troops safer in combat, and to crack down on domestic violence. As Chairwoman of the Rules Committee, she played a key role in advancing the Floor major legislation, including the Recovery Act, Affordable Care Act, Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform, and the Don’t Ask Don’t Tell Repeal Act.

None of us who served with her ever doubted her tenacity or resolve. Louise never forgot her roots or the constituents who sent her back to Congress year after year. Her loss is a great loss for this House, for the people of upstate New York, and for our country. I join in offering my condolences to her daughters Megan, Amy, and Emily and their families.
WHAT IS HAPPENING IN OUR NATION'S DEBT

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, as I get myself organized here, this evening I am going to actually try to do something that is probably a little dangerous and a little tricky. I am going to try to do some math from behind the microphone.

You know, we have a running joke in our office that being a Member of Congress means you often work in a math-free zone but the math always wins.

And, you know, to our friends over here, I guess I should—I don't mean to jump onto this, but we just heard some of the discussion about Ms. Slaughter. I am, obviously, from a different part of this country. I have a different philosophy, and she was always incredibly kind to me and funny. Most people, I don't know, completely understand. She had a brutal wit, and so a couple of times, when I would go in front of the Rules Committee, sometimes they would ask back and forth, you sat there and go: Is she just playing with me? So just for my friends that are just leaving from that.

All right. So I am going to try to do a couple of things here. Mr. Speaker, I am actually sort of walk through what was in the most recent CBO report, but also a couple of the previous CBO reports and what is happening in our Nation's debt. At the same time, I am also going to talk about some of the positive things that are happening, and some of it because of the tax reform, some of the things that are happening in our unemployment and opportunity out there.

So, first off, let's walk through a couple of these numbers, and then I am going to grind through these so it tells a story of where we are going and where we are at as a country.

When we get behind these microphones and say, “We have an entitlement crisis coming that we have to deal with,” they have been saying it behind these microphones for 30 years. Well, it is here. The peak of the baby boom, I think, today, is about 62 years old. There are 74 million of us who are baby boomers, and then I am going to grind through these so it tells a story of where we are going and where we are at as a country.

When we get behind these microphones and say, “We have an entitlement crisis coming that we have to deal with,” they have been saying it behind these microphones for 30 years. Well, it is here. The peak of the baby boom, I think, today, is about 62 years old. There are 74 million of us who are baby boomers, and then I am going to grind through these so it tells a story of where we are going and where we are at as a country.

Yet if you look at the Pew poll from a couple of years ago, only 15 percent of Republicans believe there is an entitlement crisis coming, but only 5 percent of Democrats believe it. So this is one of the great difficulties in this body where you often hear us saying: Speak truth to power. Well, how about math to power?

Or because it has been easier to say things like: Well, the problem is waste and fraud. There are problems with waste and fraud, but the numbers are tiny compared to what is about to happen.

So, some baseline math. When I was born, 1962, there were five workers for every one retiree. Today—and let's actually do 12 years from now, because that is when it gets dramatic. Twelve years from now, there will only be two. You and your spouse will be covering one retiree. In just my lifetime, we have gone from six workers to one retiree.

The math is brutal. So think about this. Over the last decade—so from 2008 to 2018—if you actually look at the growth in the size of spending in the government, 72 percent of it was just Social Security and Medicare. So if you actually look at the growth of the Federal spending, do understand, over the last 10 years, 72 percent of that growth was just those two programs: Social Security and Medicare.

Over the next 10 years, just the growth will be about $1.3 trillion. That is, functionally, just the growth in Social Security and Medicare will be the full Department of Defense. It is important to get our head around telling the truth, because if we are going to save these earned entitlements, we need to have that moment of reflection that comes off of a calculator instead of what happens so often behind these microphones where we try to make public policy by feelings.

So, first board I have up here, this is from the latest CBO report, which I actually have in here, which I am trying to keep from falling off the podium here, and there is actually some good news here. And, that is, because of what is going on the last couple of quarters, this last year, substantially, I believe, because of what is happening through our economic policies, whether it be the tax reform, whether it be what is happening in the regulatory environment, you are actually seeing revenue go into the trust funds go up a bit.

It is still a crisis, but if you actually look at SSDI, which is Social Security Disability Insurance, I think it was maybe 1 1/2, 2 years ago I got behind this microphone, and there were only like 4 years left in the trust fund, and it went to zero.

Well, we gained almost 3 additional years. Now, some of that is because of policy, some of it is because of revenue because we have so many more people working right now. If you actually also take a look at some of the money going into Social Security, some of the money going into Medicare part A, that is the trust fund portion, we are actually picking up a couple of years—1 year here, 2 years there—in additional actuarial soundness of the trust funds.

Think of this as an opportunity. If we are going to have to make policy—and as I stand behind this microphone, I am looking for a unified theory. It is not just entitlement reform because, let's face it, that is the third rail. People go nuts. They run attack ads on you. It is more complicated. We need to do those things in our society that help people be employed, do the things policies, training policies, opportunity policies, because the more of our brothers and sisters who are working—how do we go from 63 percent labor force participation, which is a wonderful number from where we would be 10 years ago till now, how do we get it to go further?

How do we get more of our brothers and sisters to move from being the long-term unemployed, the discouraged workers, and get them to move into the opportunities that are out there right now because we have, apparently, millions of jobs that are looking for workers, but it also does powerful things to these programs. We are also going to have to be honest about mechanisms within immigration. We have a birthright crisis in this country. The last few years, if you actually look at the number of babies we are having, our numbers have substantially collapsed.

Well, remember, today's child is tomorrow's worker; and if in today's world, when you turn 65 and begin some of your benefits, the math is, you are going to understand about your adult life in retirement, but we don't have enough young people because these programs are pay-as-you-go programs. That is really important as we sort of walk through the math.

So if you are looking for that unified theory, it even adds in things like trade. If we are going to be a country that is very slow on our birthrate and immigration, we have designed a talent-based immigration system that also does some rewards for younger demographics, but we are also going to have to have trade with countries that also have positive demographics so we actually have customers.

There are lots of things that all have to be thought of together. And something I am not going to do tonight, but I have done other evenings and we will do in a month or so, is a fixation on technology and how technology also can provide amazing opportunity in everything from changing the healthcare curve to actually allowing more of our brothers and sisters to participate in the workforce, even those with certain difficulties in life or even those who may be older and choose to work. Instead of being scared of technology, I think it may be our solution, depending on some of these cost curves.

So what is important here is, as you look at this chart, just take a look at this first number here. That is the Social Security trust fund. Now, as you know, our general fund has taken that money and borrowed it, and then we replace it with sort of special Social Security IOUs.

Now, if I remember correctly, last year we were paying the Social Security trust fund like 3.1 percent interest
for those borrowed moneys. So when you see some of the future slides here, or boards, you will actually see, here is the trust fund balance; but, also, here it is with some of the interest revenue that we also pay ourselves back.

So think of this craziness. Functionally, we are paying more money to pay back the borrowed money because that cash that we took out of those trust funds has long since been spent. But on this board, in 10 years, the Social Security trust fund is cut in half. In just a few years, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund is empty, and if you actually can see it, the hospital, the Medicare part A, which is the only part really with the trust fund, in a few years, it is also down to zero.

So just getting our heads around, this is reality, this is math, but it is better than it was a year or so ago, but it is still a crisis. And these, I am going to put up two of these boards that is just going to show—do you see this sort of flat line? That is actually part of the good news because where you see—last year, it would have been a constant curve downward that we were depleting the funds. As you know, they have gone negative this year, meaning that the revenues coming out of Social Security is actually greater than the revenues coming in, except for, since the tax reform and some of the economic expansion, all of a sudden we have hit a bit of a plateau.

So think of the experience, 1980, 1981, 1982, when we were in a real crisis. And you see the lines there, the red line there. The variance in those is what we are also paying ourselves back as a spiff in interest.

CBO actually had it looking like it was going up for a couple of years. I am actually much more optimistic than some of their baseline numbers, but that is that actual mathematical reprieve. You also see the two lines there. The variance in those is what we are also paying ourselves back as a spiff in interest.

So this one is Social Security, Old-Age Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. But then when we actually move over to the hospital fund—and important, you are going to see a future slide, Social Security, in many ways, isn’t my crisis—isn’t our crisis, because it is a defined benefit. Fixing it, the math is actually fairly easy.

Remember my number before, that if we just do Social Security and Medicare over the last 10 years, 72 percent of the increased spending we had as a government, in the Federal Government, was just the growth in Social Security and Medicare. Okay. But if you add in also interest on top of it, it goes from 72 to 91 percent. So understand, those are the levers that are going to squeeze out so many of the other things that are happening, but also the greatest fragility to being safe here.

Let’s actually go onto the next board because I think it helps actually sort of where we are and what is also important here is, as you look at these, those on the bottom, you will actually see things like defense and discretionary spending all being fairly flat, even with the most recent budget appropriation bills. If you actually look at it over the next decade or over the next three decades, almost all of the growth in spending comes from the two programs and covering interest costs.

This one is really noisy, and we will put these up, or put them out. Over the next 30 years—this one actually goes from 1960, but when you get here, look defense discretionary, it is actually not a time. 2047. It seems like a lifetime from now, but you are in 2018 right now. So reach out 20 years from now, reach out 30 years from now.

Defense is 2.7 percent of spending equal to the size of the economy, so this is a per GDP slide. But the exploitation, you see that red area, in that time when I am hopefully well into my retirement, 15.6 percent of the entire size of the economy. So we are going to reach in and take—say the economy is this big—we are going to take 15.6 percent of that, and that is just going to be Social Security and Medicare. And another 6.2 percent will be covering the interest costs.

It is unsustainable, when you start to realize you will be approaching 30 percent of the entire gross domestic product of this country in Federal spending. It is not defense, it is not non-discretionary spending, it is actually not even some of the other entitlements, even though sometimes that is easier to talk about behind these microphones. It really is where we are demographically as a society.

And look, demographics is our destiny. We can’t pretend it is not happening. We are all getting older. It is the nature of life. And understand also, these numbers are assuming no wars, no recessions, no disasters. These are just baseline numbers, and that should make this really, really scary.

So how do I convince our voters and my fellow Members that we have a little bit of reprieve right now because we are in a time of terrific economic expansion, terrific employment, and good numbers coming in on the FICA tax? How do we use this as a moment to actually say, let’s be adults, let’s come up with something much more elegant and honest in our entitlements. But what’s important is, as you actually look at it over the next 3 or 4 years, that is actually really important: Social Security, Health Entitlements, and Interest Costs. So you have to put in the paying interest on all of the money we have borrowed as a society. Driving 91 percent of the 2008 to 2009 spending hikes.

Remember my number before, that if we just do Social Security and Medicare over the last 10 years, 72 percent of the increased spending we had as a government, in the Federal Government, was just the growth in Social Security and Medicare. Okay. But if you add in also interest on top of it, it goes from 72 to 91 percent. So understand, those are the levers that are going to squeeze out so many of the other things that are happening, but also the greatest fragility to being safe here.

Let’s actually go onto the next board because I think it helps actually sort of where we are and what is also important here is, as you look at these, those on the bottom, you will actually see things like defense and discretionary spending all being fairly flat, even with the most recent budget appropriation bills. If you actually look at it over the next decade or over the next three decades, almost all of the growth in spending comes from the two programs and covering interest costs.

Defense is 2.7 percent of spending equal to the size of the economy, so this is a per GDP slide. But the exploitation, you see that red area, in that time when I am hopefully well into my retirement, 15.6 percent of the entire size of the economy. So we are going to reach in and take—say the economy is this big—we are going to take 15.6 percent of that, and that is just going to be Social Security and Medicare. And another 6.2 percent will be covering the interest costs.

It is unsustainable, when you start to realize you will be approaching 30 percent of the entire gross domestic product of this country in Federal spending. It is not defense, it is not non-discretionary spending, it is actually not even some of the other entitlements, even though sometimes that is easier to talk about behind these microphones. It really is where we are demographically as a society.

And look, demographics is our destiny. We can’t pretend it is not happening. We are all getting older. It is the nature of life. And understand also, these numbers are assuming no wars, no recessions, no disasters. These are just baseline numbers, and that should make this really, really scary.

So how do I convince our voters and my fellow Members that we have a little bit of reprieve right now because we are in a time of terrific economic expansion, terrific employment, and good numbers coming in on the FICA tax? How do we use this as a moment to actually say, let’s be adults, let’s come up with something much more elegant and honest in our entitlements. But what’s important is, as you actually look at it over the next 3 or 4 years, that is actually really important: Social Security, Health Entitlements, and Interest Costs. So you have to put in the paying interest on all of the money we have borrowed as a society. Driving 91 percent of the 2008 to 2009 spending hikes.

Remember my number before, that if we just do Social Security and Medicare over the last 10 years, 72 percent of the increased spending we had as a government, in the Federal Government, was just the growth in Social Security and Medicare. Okay. But if you add in also interest on top of it, it goes from 72 to 91 percent. So understand, those are the levers that are going to squeeze out so many of the other things that are happening, but also the greatest fragility to being safe here.

Let’s actually go onto the next board because I think it helps actually sort of where we are and what is also important here is, as you look at these, those on the bottom, you will actually see things like defense and discretionary spending all being fairly flat, even with the most recent budget appropriation bills. If you actually look at it over the next decade or over the next three decades, almost all of the growth in spending comes from the two programs and covering interest costs.

Defense is 2.7 percent of spending equal to the size of the economy, so this is a per GDP slide. But the exploitation, you see that red area, in that time when I am hopefully well into my retirement, 15.6 percent of the entire size of the economy. So we are going to reach in and take—say the economy is this big—we are going to take 15.6 percent of that, and that is just going to be Social Security and Medicare. And another 6.2 percent will be covering the interest costs.

It is unsustainable, when you start to realize you will be approaching 30 percent of the entire gross domestic product of this country in Federal spending. It is not defense, it is not non-discretionary spending, it is actually not even some of the other entitlements, even though sometimes that is easier to talk about behind these microphones. It really is where we are demographically as a society.

And look, demographics is our destiny. We can’t pretend it is not happening. We are all getting older. It is the nature of life. And understand also, these numbers are assuming no wars, no recessions, no disasters. These are just baseline numbers, and that should make this really, really scary.

So how do I convince our voters and my fellow Members that we have a little bit of reprieve right now because we are in a time of terrific economic expansion, terrific employment, and good numbers coming in on the FICA tax? How do we use this as a moment to actually say, let’s be adults, let’s come up with something much more elegant and honest in our entitlements. But what’s important is, as you actually look at it over the next 3 or 4 years, that is actually really important: Social Security, Health Entitlements, and Interest Costs. So you have to put in the paying interest on all of the money we have borrowed as a society. Driving 91 percent of the 2008 to 2009 spending hikes.

Remember my number before, that if we just do Social Security and Medicare over the last 10 years, 72 percent of the increased spending we had as a government, in the Federal Government, was just the growth in Social Security and Medicare. Okay. But if you add in also interest on top of it, it goes from 72 to 91 percent. So understand, those are the levers that are going to squeeze out so many of the other things that are happening, but also the greatest fragility to being safe here.

Let’s actually go onto the next board because I think it helps actually sort of where we are and what is also important here is, as you look at these, those on the bottom, you will actually see things like defense and discretionary spending all being fairly flat, even with the most recent budget appropriation bills. If you actually look at it over the next decade or over the next three decades, almost all of the growth in spending comes from the two programs and covering interest costs.
Because I believe if we do things that maximize economic growth, things that actually help our Nation’s demographics, if we adopt a very aggressive adoption of technology, particularly in the healthcare space, and also provide some, in the entitlements, is it all stuff we should have done 10 years ago, but we have been given a little bit of reprieve right now because of what is happening in the economic growth.

So here is something to get our heads around. If you actually look at the numbers, you see the first two bar charts, that is Social Security. It turns out the average American will put in about $450,000 over their working life. And this is something that is really tiring right now. And they are going to get out $616,000. So, okay, a little variance. Now, the problem is we have obviously already spent all of that money that was in the trust fund and we put I/OUs in it. It is a fair deal.

Medicare is our crisis. Apparently, someone who is retiring today will have put in about $140,000 in Medicare taxes. But the person who retires today is taking out about $122,000. So $140,000 in, $122,000 out. Now multiply that by just 74 million of us who are baby boomers and you start to understand the size and the scale of where the gap is coming from. It is math.

I don’t think there was a way to blind the political rage and just say, it is math, and the math will always win. And if we would step up and be less political and more like accountants for a moment—and I am sorry, I know as a Republican, Medicare is our crisis. Apparently, someone who is retiring today will have put in about $140,000 in Medicare taxes. But the person who retires today is taking out about $122,000. So $140,000 in, $122,000 out. Now multiply that by just 74 million of us who are baby boomers and you start to understand the size and the scale of where the gap is coming from. It is math.

So the violence, the cruelty we are going to do to our society if we continue to avoid the reality of the math, in a decade or a decade and a half from now when the crisis is upon us, our ability to fix it will be very, very difficult. It is going to be difficult right now, but it is doable. There are approaches to make these numbers work.

The folks who are new deficit hawks or newfound deficit hawks, a time for a moment of honesty and reality. Over the next 30 years—this is partially because of my little girl ever. I have a mug that says so. I have a 2 1/2-year-old that is the best little girl I am incredibly blessed. We are really difficult for all of us.

So I guess, ultimately, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple messages here. I understand we are sort of in a time of very difficult politics, but we need to sort of grow up and deal with the reality.

We are getting older as a society. We have made lots and lots of promises. We need to keep those promises. There is no way to do it. Even December, so there are good things happening there. So, hopefully, these numbers would actually expand from there.

But if you actually put the growth back in, they were estimating $384 billion of growth in new revenues because of the bigger economy, more business spending, more jobs, more opportunity. Now, most of that is from what was happening in those accounts, the repatriation of those moneys back in and actually encouraging companies to actually come back to the United States and work here, we actually gain $324 billion.

All right. So I am still negative $329 billion over the 10 years on those C corps, the big corporations, but then on the next Joint Tax report, they talked about the dynamic scoring, what they saw as the growth estimates.

Not to bore everyone with it, but we have already seen the CBO has actually lifted up the growth estimates from even December, so there are good things happening there. So, hopefully, these numbers would actually expand from there.

So it turns out the business portion on the tax reform bill, in the Joint Tax’s own numbers, actually is about $55 billion to the upside in their own modeling over the 10 years. I personally put this up because I was embarrassed I didn’t see it in their math sooner, but that is what it is.

So I guess, ultimately, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple messages here. I understand we are sort of in a time of very difficult politics, but we need to sort of grow up and deal with the reality.

We are getting older as a society. We have made lots and lots of promises. We need to keep those promises. There is no way to do it. Even December, so there are good things happening there. So, hopefully, these numbers would actually expand from there.

But if you actually put the growth back in, they were estimating $384 billion of growth in new revenues because of the bigger economy, more business spending, more jobs, more opportunity. Now, most of that is from what was happening in those accounts, the repatriation of those moneys back in and actually encouraging companies to actually come back to the United States and work here, we actually gain $324 billion.

All right. So I am still negative $329 billion over the 10 years on those C corps, the big corporations, but then on the next Joint Tax report, they talked about the dynamic scoring, what they saw as the growth estimates.

Not to bore everyone with it, but we have already seen the CBO has actually lifted up the growth estimates from even December, so there are good things happening there. So, hopefully, these numbers would actually expand from there.

So it turns out the business portion on the tax reform bill, in the Joint Tax’s own numbers, actually is about $55 billion to the upside in their own modeling over the 10 years. I personally put this up because I was embarrassed I didn’t see it in their math sooner, but that is what it is.

So I guess, ultimately, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple messages here. I understand we are sort of in a time of very difficult politics, but we need to sort of grow up and deal with the reality.

We are getting older as a society. We have made lots and lots of promises. We need to keep those promises. There is no way to do it. Even December, so there are good things happening there. So, hopefully, these numbers would actually expand from there.

But if you actually put the growth back in, they were estimating $384 billion of growth in new revenues because of the bigger economy, more business spending, more jobs, more opportunity. Now, most of that is from what was happening in those accounts, the repatriation of those moneys back in and actually encouraging companies to actually come back to the United States and work here, we actually gain $324 billion.

All right. So I am still negative $329 billion over the 10 years on those C corps, the big corporations, but then on the next Joint Tax report, they talked about the dynamic scoring, what they saw as the growth estimates.

Not to bore everyone with it, but we have already seen the CBO has actually lifted up the growth estimates from even December, so there are good things happening there. So, hopefully, these numbers would actually expand from there.

So it turns out the business portion on the tax reform bill, in the Joint Tax’s own numbers, actually is about $55 billion to the upside in their own modeling over the 10 years. I personally put this up because I was embarrassed I didn’t see it in their math sooner, but that is what it is.

So I guess, ultimately, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple messages here. I understand we are sort of in a time of very difficult politics, but we need to sort of grow up and deal with the reality.
maybe it is time we do the most difficult thing any of us would ever do in our elected career, and that is actually take on the biggest issue of our times, and that is the unfunded liabilities and the promises we have made?

Do the hard things, because the hard things are how we are going to be judged in our future when all of us as elected Members leave here. Will we have saved the country from its greatest threat, which is the debt that is going to come crashing down on us very, very soon?

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 18, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4557. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting FY 2019 budget amendments for the Departments of Agriculture, Energy, Defense, Education, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, Housing and Urban Development, the Interior, Justice, Labor, State, Transportation, the Treasury, and Veterans Affairs, and the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Science Foundation, Social Security Administration, U.S. Agency for International Development, and Other International Programs (H. Doc. No. 115-36); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4558. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Terry J. Benedict, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 5570(c)-(d) (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 212; 110 Stat. 253); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4559. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Report for Fiscal Year 2019, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2801, Public Law 101-510, Sec. 1483(a) (as amended by Public Law 112-81, Sec. 1070); (125 Stat. 1592); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4560. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Real Estate Appraisals [Docket No.: FR-1556] (RIN: 7100-AE34) received April 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.


4562. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Minimum Secu-
Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-
cy’s final rule — Approval of Nebraska Air
Quality Implementation Plans, Operating
Permits Program, and 121(f) Program; Revi-
sion to the National Emission Standards
for Hazardous Air Pollutants: [EPA-R07-
OAR-2017-0435; FRL-9976-52-Region 7] re-
cieved April 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.
801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110
Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and
Commerce.

4572. A letter from the Director, Regu-
ulatory Management Division, Environmental
Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-
cy’s final rule — Findings of Failure to Sub-
mit State Implementation Plan Submissions for
the sulfur dioxide primary national ambient air
quality standards (NAAQS) [EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0135; FRL-9976-
35-OAR] received April 5, 2018, pursuant to 5
U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on En-
ergy and Commerce.

4573. A letter from the Director, Regu-
ulatory Management Division, Environmental
Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-
cy’s final rule — Air Quality Designations
for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) Primary
National Ambient Air Quality Standard —
Round 3 — Supplemental Amendment [EPA-
HQ-OAR-2017-0003; FRL-9976-40-OAR] re-
cieved April 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.
801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on En-
ergy and Commerce.

4574. A letter from the Director, Regu-
ulatory Management Division, Environmental
Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-
cy’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of
Air Quality Implementation Plans;2\thasn’t

4575. A letter from the Director, Regu-

4576. A letter from the Director, Regu-

4577. A letter from the Director, Regu-

4578. A letter from the Secretary, Depart-

4579. A letter from the Secretary, Depart-

4580. A letter from the Assistant Secretary
for Export Administration, Bureau of Indus-
try and Security, Department of Commerce,
transmitting a report certifying that the export
of the listed items to the People’s Republic of
China is not detrimental to the U.S. space
launch industry, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778
note; Public Law 105-261, Sec. 151 (as amended by Public
Law 107-277, Sec. 146); (112 Stat. 2174); to the Com-
mittee on Foreign Affairs.

4580. A letter from the Secretary to the
Department of Commerce, transmitting a report
certifying that the export of the listed item
to the People’s Republic of China is not det-

4581. A letter from the Assistant Secretary
for Public Affairs.

4582. A letter from the Secretary, Depart-
ment of Commerce, transmitting a report
certifying that the export of the listed item
to the People’s Republic of China is not det-
arimental to the U.S. space launch industry,
pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778 note; Public Law
105-261, Sec. 151 (as amended by Public
Law 107-277, Sec. 146); (112 Stat. 2174); to the Com-
mittee on Foreign Affairs.

4583. A letter to the Committee on Over-
sight and Government Reform.

4584. A letter from the Executive Analyst
Political Office, Department of Health and
Human Services, transmitting a notification
of an action on nomination, and discontinu-
ance of service in acting role, pursuant to 5
U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-261, Sec. 151(b); (112
Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Over-
sight and Government Reform.

4585. A letter from the Executive Analyst
Political Office, Department of Health and
Human Services, transmitting a notification
on an action on nomination, and discontinu-
ance of service in acting role, pursuant to 5
U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-261, Sec. 151(b); (112
Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Over-
sight and Government Reform.

4586. A letter from the Associate General
Counsel for General Law, U.S. Customs and
Border Protection, Department of Homeland
Security, transmitting a notification on an
action on nomination, and discontinuance of
service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.
3349(a); Public Law 105-261, Sec. 151(b); (112
Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and
Government Reform.

4587. A letter from the Assistant Secretary
for Export Administration, Bureau of Indus-

4588. A letter from the Secretary, Depart-
ment of Agriculture, transmitting a report
certifying that the export of the listed item
to the People’s Republic of China is not det-
4589. A letter from the Assistant Secretary
for Export Administration, Bureau of Indus-
try and Security, Department of Commerce,
transmitting a report certifying that the export
of the listed items to the People’s Republic of
China is not detrimental to the U.S. space
launch industry, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778
note; Public Law 105-261, Sec. 151 (as amended by Public
Law 107-277, Sec. 146); (112 Stat. 2174); to the Com-
mittee on Foreign Affairs.

4590. A letter to the Committee, Depart-
ment of Commerce, transmitting a report
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following
titles were introduced and severally re-
ferred, as follows:

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr.
SMITH of Texas, Mr. HENNINGER, Mr.
KING of Iowa, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BUSCEN
Mr. BARR, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNN, Mr.
WOMACK, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr.
ROKTA):

H.R. 5393. A bill to amend title 18, United
States Code, to provide for certain sen-
tencing enhancements relating to illegal re-
entry offenses, and to clarify the manner in
which sentences for such offenses are to be
served and for other purposes; to the Com-
mittee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Ms.
LOFUREN):

H.R. 5357. A bill to establish the Daniel
Webster Congressional Clerkship Program;
to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. KELLY
of Mississippi, Mr. BRADY of Pennsyl-
vanila, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms.
ROSEN):

H.R. 5358. A bill to direct the Secretary of
Defense to submit to the Congress a plan for
improvements to traumatic brain injury and
post-traumatic stress research; to the Com-
mittee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 5359. A bill to provide for the transfer
of certain Federal land in the State of Min-
nesota for the benefit of the Leech Lake Band
of Ojibwe; to the Committee on Nat-
ural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5360. A bill to amend the Farm Secu-
rity and Natural Resources Investment Act of
2014 to repeal desert terminal lakes assistance;
to the Committee on Agriculture, and in ad-
dition to the Committee on Natural Resources,
for a period to be subsequently determined by
the Speaker, in each case for consideration of
such provisions as fall within the jurisdi-
cion of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and
Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 5351. A bill to provide for a com-
prehensive, multifaceted approach to pre-
venting and treating opioid addiction; to the
Committee on Oversight and Government Re-
form; to the Committee on Education and
Labor; to the Committee on Veterans’ Af-

H.R. 5527. A bill to direct the Speaker of the
House to provide for consideration of such
provisions as fall within the jurisdi-
cion of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself and Mr.
SANFORD):

H.R. 5532. A bill to redesignate the Recon-
struction Era National Monument as the Re-
construction Era National Historical Park,
and for other purposes; to the Committee on
Natural Resources.

By Mr. DOOGERTT (for himself, Mr.
RASKIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California,
Mr. PICONE, Mr. POCAH, Mr. JACKSON
of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, and Mr.
COHEN):

H.R. 5533. A bill to require a report of any
Special Counsel who is removed from office,
and for other purposes; to the Committee on
Judiciary.

By Mr. DYKES (for himself and Mr.
PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 5544. A bill to amend the Consumer
Financial Protection Act of 2010 to provide
procedures for guidance issued by the Bureau
of Consumer Financial Protection, and for
other purposes; to the Committee on Finan-
cial Services.

By Mr. MCCaul (for himself and Mr.
ENGEL):
H.R. 5535. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 regarding energy diplomacy and security within the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McEACHIN (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LANGIEVIN, Mrs. WATTS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. AL Green of Texas, Mr. YEARY, Mr. Moulton, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. Peters, Mr. TEIGE, Mr. SCHAEZER, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. FOCAN, Mr. SANCHEZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. DENGELL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NOR顿, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. TUTUS, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 5535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the credit for expenditures to provide access to disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5537. A bill to authorize grantee of Department of Justice grants to set up task forces on solving local communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. BIGGOMAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. O’ROURKE, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. Poliquin, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 5538. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of certain additional periods of active duty service for purposes of suspending charges to veterans’ entitlement to educational assistance under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs during periods of suspension and participation in vocational rehabilitation programs; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 5539. A bill to set the annual rate of compensation for a Member of Congress who has served six consecutive terms as a Member of the House of Representatives or two consecutive terms as a Senator at $1, to amend title 27, United States Code, to exclude any service of a Member of Congress occurring during any pay period for which the Member’s annual rate of compensation is $1 as credits toward purposes of an annuity under that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 5540. A bill to direct the Director of National Intelligence to prepare a National Intelligence Estimate on Hizbollah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. UPTON (for himself and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 5541. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide equal coverage of in vitro specific IgE tests and percutaneous tests for allergies under the Medicare Medical programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENFILLAT, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. ENCICIA):

H.R. 5542. A bill to establish a grant program under which the Secretary of Transportation will reimburse public transportation agencies that offer free unlimited transfers to eligible individuals; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5543. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for a credit for tax on certain flood insurance expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 5544. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 44, United States Code, to require the maintenance of certain records for 3 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MATSU):

H.R. 5545. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Barbara M. Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 833. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

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. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 5526. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I—The Congress shall have the Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 5527. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 5528. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution: “Congress shall have the power . . . to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.”

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 5529. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2—The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5530. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 5531. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress’s specified powers are primarily, but not exclusively, found in Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution. This section contains 18 clauses, 17 of which enumerate relevant specific powers granted to the Congress. Among the powers enumerated are Congress’s powers to regulate commerce.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 5532. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 5533. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 5534. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. MCCAU:

H.R. 5535. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. McEACHIN:

H.R. 5536. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5537. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 5538. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 5539. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5540. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (relating to Congress’s specific powers to regulate commerce).

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 5541. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. The Congress shall have the Power to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5542. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. WALKER:
H. R. 594.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:
H. J. Res. 133.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government’s ability to accept the original Smithson donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate the powers enumerated in earlier clauses such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XXI, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:
H. R. 103: Ms. BONAMICI.
H. R. 290: Mrs. BLACK.
H. R. 389: Mrs. GABBARD.
H. R. 394: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. R. 502: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H. R. 644: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H. R. 771: Mr. GOMEZ.
H. R. 788: Mr. Tipton.
H. R. 909: Mr. KNIGHT.
H. R. 911: Mr. ROUZER.
H. R. 941: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. HUNTER.
H. R. 859: Mr. PASCARELL.
H. R. 1130: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. R. 1150: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. R. 1300: Mr. SUOZZI.
H. R. 1316: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H. R. 1318: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. R. 1338: Mr. KRINSNAMOORTHI.
H. R. 1445: Mr. BRAT.
H. R. 1511: Ms. Moore and Ms. BONAMICI.
H. R. 1592: Mr. ROKITA.
H. R. 1596: Mr. MITCHELL.
H. R. 1693: Mr. SCHIPP.
H. R. 1697: Mr. BRAT.
H. R. 1762: Mr. ROOKWOOD.
H. R. 1817: Mr. McNERNEY.
H. R. 1825: Mr. EVANS.
H. R. 1861: Mr. O’ROURKE.
H. R. 1870: Mr. CAEBALJAL.
H. R. 1876: Mr. PASO, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H. R. 1928: Mr. KATKO.
H. R. 1967: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. R. 2043: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H. R. 2069: Mr. ROYDEN Davis of Illinois.
H. R. 2077: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H. R. 2095: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H. R. 2212: Ms. SCHATZ and Mr. GIBBS.
H. R. 2242: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. R. 2270: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. R. 2293: Mr. ROSS and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H. R. 2317: Mr. SUOZZI.
H. R. 2327: Mr. T. SMITHSON of Pennsylvania.
H. R. 2358: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H. R. 2418: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H. R. 2553: Mr. WEBER of Tennessee, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MALFALFA, and Mr. HILL.
H. R. 2584: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POLI, and Mr. BUMENAEUR.
H. R. 2599: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H. R. 2747: Mr. KIND.
H. R. 2953: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H. R. 2976: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. ROYDEN Davis of Illinois, and Mr. VALADAO.
H. R. 3174: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H. R. 3192: Mr. SHAWN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H. R. 3356: Mr. ROKITA.
H. R. 3378: Mr. TAKANO.
H. R. 3400: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H. R. 3536: Ms. BONAMICI.
H. R. 3545: Mr. DUNN, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. ROKITA.
H. R. 3591: Mr. NOHR CROSS.
H. R. 3655: Mr. COURTNEY.
H. R. 3681: Mr. CULBERSON.
H. R. 3692: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H. R. 3751: Mr. COHEN.
H. R. 3767: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. SCHIPP.
H. R. 3798: Mr. BUDDE.
H. R. 3842: Mr. ESTY of Connecticut.
H. R. 3871: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. R. 3938: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. R. 3956: Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. WENSTROOP.
H. R. 3994: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H. R. 4001: Mr. COHEN, Mr. PCAN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. R. 4023: Ms. SHERMAN.
H. R. 4099: Mr. VISCLUSKY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H. R. 4106: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. BROWNLY of California.
H. R. 4122: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. R. 4143: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H. R. 4177: Mr. SANFORD.
H. R. 4215: Mr. CRIST.
H. R. 4269: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. R. 4268: Ms. BASS and Ms. MATSUI.
H. R. 4306: Ms. BROWN.
H. R. 4633: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. BROWNLY of California, and Mr. PETERS.
H. R. 4638: Mrs. MC MORRIS RODGERS.
H. R. 4691: Mr. MORGAN.
H. R. 4693: Ms. LOPRENO.
H. R. 4733: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut and Ms. BONAMICI.
H. R. 4805: Mr. MEADORS.
H. R. 4815: Mr. MEIKS.
H. R. 4821: Mr. NUNES.
H. R. 4841: Mr. RENACCI.
H. R. 4844: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. MICHELLE LUCAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H. R. 4968: Mrs. LOVE.
H. R. 4983: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. R. 5001: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. R. 5012: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H. R. 5040: Mr. CHABOT.
H. R. 5041: Mr. BUMENAEUR.
H. R. 5096: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. R. 5121: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. TUPON.
H. R. 5129: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H. R. 5132: Mr. ROYDEN Davis of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PA- 

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY Mr. BRADY of Texas
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H. R. 4 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.
The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, Ruler of the Universe, the Sustainer of Life, and the Father of Humanity, great is Your faithfulness, Lord, forgive us when our courage wavers in the face of difficulties because we ignore Your abiding presence. Thank You for imparting wisdom, patience, and strength to our lawmakers. Sustain them with Your presence, and strengthen them with Your love, Lord, keep them strong, hold them steady, and carry them through each challenge with honor. Grant that they will meet their hardships and setbacks with a firm faith in Your sustaining presence. We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The majority leader is recognized.

**COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION BILL**
Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday afternoon I filed cloture on S. 1129, the Coast Guard Authorization Act, a comprehensive package that equips an adaptable force to meet a variety of important missions. I hope my colleagues will join me in ensuring its swift consideration and passage this week.

**CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION**
Mr. McCONNELL. First, Madam President, the Senate will consider yet another chance to use the Congressional Review Act and repeal yet another of the last administration's run-away regulations. Thanks to Senator MORAN and Senator TOOMEY, today's effort will protect consumers from a brazen attempt by the past Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to stretch his authority and interfere in the auto industry.

The Dodd-Frank Act of 2010 got a lot of things wrong, but one thing Dodd-Frank got right was protecting auto dealers from meddling by the CFPB.

Our Democratic colleagues are usually fans of Federal regulations. I guess even they had a hunch that, left unchecked, the Federal bureaucracy would find a way to put the brakes on this key industry—and how right they were.

In 2013, Federal regulators concocted a loophole. They bypassed standard review and public comment periods for Federal regulations and instead issued guidance that would regulate auto dealers' ability to negotiate loan terms with their customers.

Dodd-Frank already gave the CFPB unprecedented insulation from the American people's elected representatives, but apparently that wasn't enough because they still attempted an end run around the express prohibition on the regulation of auto dealers with guidance they assumed would not be subject to the Congressional Review Act. Well, today Senator TOOMEY foiled that plan when he asked GAO for an opinion on whether this guidance was, in fact, intrusive rulemaking that should be subject to congressional review. GAO decided that indeed it was, and now Congress will have its say.

Republicans are chopping away at the tangled mess of regulations that the last administration left behind. Our whole economy is getting a tune-up, and now it is time for the front end of the auto industry to come along for the ride.

We used the Congressional Review Act a record 15 times last year. Let's join with our colleagues from Pennsylvania and Kansas and add another victory to that list.

**TAX REFORM**
Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, today is tax day, the deadline for most Americans to file their tax returns. For many middle-class households, that means sending too much of their hard-earned money off to the IRS—hardly cause for celebration. But this year, the gray clouds of tax day have a silver lining. Today is the very last time that American families will have to file under the unfair, outdated Tax Code that Congress and the President got rid of a few months ago. Out with the old and in with the new.

Republicans' historic overhaul cut taxes for families and small businesses. We doubled the standard deduction, expanded the child tax credit, and lowered rates as well. And we accomplished all of this while preserving key middle-class provisions, such as the mortgage interest deduction. The upshot of all of this is simple: major tax relief for middle-class families and a big shot in the arm for the U.S. economy, which will lead to more—and higher-paying—homegrown American jobs.

Already, tax reform has given American workers a raise, since less of each paycheck needs to be withheld for the IRS. When all is said and done, the Treasury Department estimates that our tax cuts will leave 90 percent of wage-earners with more take-home pay—that is 90 percent of wage earners with more take-home pay as a result of our tax reform measure.

In addition, millions of Americans are receiving special bonuses, pay raises, or new benefits from their employers as a direct result of tax reform. Thousand-dollar bonuses for workers at Kansas City Southern Railway in Missouri; a higher starting wage at First Farmers Bank & Trust in Indiana;
higher wages and new job opportunities at CSS Distribution Group, a small business packaging and distribution company in Kentucky; billion-dollar investments in pension plans for UPS and FedEx workers—the list goes on and on.

My Democratic colleagues from New York and San Francisco scoff publicly at the idea that a $2,000 tax cut or a $1,000 bonus would make a difference for American families. They have called these things "crumbs." Something I haven’t tried is talking point around many middle-class kitchen tables. I suspect they would be laughed out of the room.

And these are just the first fruits. Tax reform laid the foundation for a more prosperous future with more good-paying American jobs. That is because we made sending jobs overseas less appealing. We created new incentives for businesses to invest, expand, build, and hire right here at home. We gave overseas competitors something to worry about—a healthy, competitive U.S. economy. Already, job creators of all shapes and sizes are investing more and expanding. For example, a furniture store in Ohio is planning a 4,500-square-foot expansion, a craft brewery in Iowa is planning to open a new production line, and a deck and patio builder in Virginia is hiring 10 new employees to meet rising demand, just to name a few.

Republicans designed every piece of tax reform to benefit middle-class families and small businesses, both right now and in the years and decades ahead. That used to be a bipartisan priority, but this time, Democrats chose to put political posturing ahead of America’s best interests. Every single Democrat in the House and every single Democrat in the Senate voted to block tax reform—and by extension, every bit of this good news—from happening. Later today, in fact, some of our colleagues across the aisle will be demonstrating against the law right here on the steps of the Capitol. I wonder whether they are protesting all the new jobs, or maybe it is the big family tax cuts, or maybe they are protesting the bonuses and wage hikes or all of the small business expansions. Their first mistake was voting to block all of this in the first place. Now, even as the economy is starting to thrive, they want to repeal these historic tax cuts and literally claw back the money. But make no mistake—Republicans will continue to stand and fight for the American people.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBAL LABOR SOVEREIGNTY BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, a brief comment on the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, which failed to move forward in the Senate last night. Indian Affairs has very rarely found its way to the floor of the Senate, despite a number of very pressing issues in Indian Country, including youth violence, educational disparities, language loss, healthcare access, broadband access, and many more. For a number of years, Democrats and Republicans on the Indian Affairs Committee have pushed legislation that would alleviate these problems. On our side of the aisle, Senators UDALL, TESTER, SMITH, BALDWIN, HEINRICH, HEITKAMP, CANTWELL, and MURRAY have worked very hard on bills that deal with these very, very significant issues in Indian Country, but none of these bills have reached the floor.

The leader has refused to put bills that would dramatically help Indian Country on the floor. When, finally, a Tribal bill was brought forward by the Senate, it was quickly stripped of amendments and debate. Senator UDALL, our ranking member, wished to have amendments. Senator HORKEN, the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, told me he wanted amendments. But the way Leader MCCONNELL brought it to the floor was with no amendments, no debate, and no discussion. Even worse, it was a bill to scrap labor rights at a time when we should be doing everything we can to strengthen labor protections. The only bill the leader would bring to the floor is one that was divisive and destined to fail—a political act, not an act to help Indian Country.

The AFL-CIO said that passage of the measure “would have amounted to the most aggressive erosion of labor protection since the 1940s.”

After many years of waiting for Tribal issues to reach the floor, I think many of us were sorely disappointed that the majority leader opted for this incredibly divisive bill, done in such an incredibly partisan way.

I hope, now that the measure has failed to advance, that the majority leader will consent to putting other Tribal bills on the floor, so many of which have broad bipartisan support and could pass at least the Senate.

RUSSIA AND SPECIAL COUNSEL LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on another issue, Russia and Mueller, yesterday it was reported that President Trump overruled the decision of his administration to implement new sanctions against Russia for its support of the brutal Assad regime in Syria in the wake of a chemical weapons attack that was devastating. Our hearts go out to those we see pictures like this.

It is only the latest action in a long pattern of behavior in which President Trump opts to treat Russia and President Putin with kid gloves. It took a very long time for President Trump to even utter a negative word about Mr. Putin, and his administration has time and again delayed the implementation of sanctions.

Reports in the press said that President Trump was unhappy with his administration’s decision to expel 60 Russians and promulgate sanctions against Russia. As citizens were victims of a Russian-linked attack. The decision to expel those diplomats was correct, in my view, but apparently the President wasn’t happy with the decision by his own appointed national security team.

The White House shouldn’t have to drag the President kicking and screaming to do the right thing when it comes to punishing Vladimir Putin and Russia. His refusal to stand up to the Kremlin is troubling, and it leaves many Americans wondering: Why and what does the President have to hide? That is what 90 percent of all Americans are asking themselves—Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative. His actions with Putin have been so confounding and so contrary to American interests that there is virtually no rational explanation for them.

At the same time, the President’s rhetoric about the Russia probe should concern all of us. Should he seek to shut down or impede the investigation by firing the Deputy Attorney General or Special Counsel Mueller, interfering with the chain of command, or issuing pardons, we would—make no mistake about it—be in a full-fledged constitutional crisis.

I urge my colleagues, all of my colleagues—Democrat, Republican, Independent—to support the bipartisan legislation in the Judiciary Committee that would protect the special counsel from a political firing. The rule of law is not a partisan issue. It is one of the most serious issues we face because that is what is at the core of being an American. That is why the whole world admires us. That is why so many families like mine have been able to climb the ladder, starting poverty as my grandparents did, to a decent life. We cannot let the rule of law become a partisan issue. Let us speak in one
loud, clear voice by passing this legislation through the Senate as soon as possible.

Finally, as well, the contradiictions, I might add, in the administration are enormous. Nikki Haley must be so embarrassed today. She forthrightly said that the situation with Russia is far too serious to rely on whim, changing attitudes, and maybe an 800-pound gorilla in the room. There is something the President is worried about.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, today is tax day. That is probably America’s least favorite holiday. It is appropriate today to look back at what has happened since the Republicans passed their tax bill last year. Since the beginning of the tax debate, Republicans have insisted their bill is about cutting taxes for working Americans, even though the crux of their bill was a massive corporate tax cut, they said that workers would benefit the most. Even though it would direct 83 percent of the benefits to the top 1 percent, they said that the bill would be a “middle-class miracle.”

How many middle-class people today think that tax bill is a miracle? Not many. The only way that could have been true was if corporations had decided to invest a substantial amount of their newfound profits in workers. That is what Republicans, after all, argued would happen.

We Democrats warned that if you gave the big corporations the lion’s share of the tax cuts, corporations would do what they always do when they have higher profits and extra cash—distribute it amongst themselves, have a nice little party. Unfortunately, the evidence is mounting that our predictions, as much as we wish they hadn’t come true, were prescient.

Since the passage of the tax bill—listen to this—corporations have spent over $250 billion on share buybacks. That is putting corporations on track to spend $200 billion and $1 trillion on share buybacks this year alone, outstripping the previous pace.

People may ask: What is a share buyback? Here is what it is. A corporation has a lot of money. Some things they can do are pay workers more, give family leave, treat their employees better. Another thing they could do is invest in new plants and equipment, new training to make that corporation more efficient and to sell more of its goods. Those are good things.

What is a bad thing? Buying back the stock. What is buying back the stock?

The corporation says: We have a million shares outstanding. If we buy back 100,000 of them, the price of the remaining ones will go up.

Who benefits? Above all, those who have a lot of the stock shares—the CEOs of the corporations and the wealthiest heads of those companies. Who else benefits? Shareholders. Eighty percent of all shares in America, despite pensions and despite 401(k)s, are held by the top 10 percent—the richest people in America. And one-third of all shares, totally, go to people overseas. That is who benefits from stock buybacks: corporations, wealthy shareholders, people overseas—more than the average American worker. That is what has happened.

Listen to this. According to a recent analysis by JUST Capital, only 6 percent of the capital allocated by companies buying back their own stock in America—note the average working person.

As USA Today put it last week: The number of companies letting workers know they are getting a bonus, raise or other form of financial compensation has slowed to a trickle. Most of the extra cash from tax savings is going into the pockets of stock shareholders through dividend increases and companies buying back their own stock in hopes of boosting its price.

The whole theory of the Republican tax bill can be summed up in two words: “trickle down.” The whole theory was to lavish corporations and the already wealthy with tax cuts and maybe the benefits might trickle down to everyone else. We are already seeing the balloon burst on that idea as corporations dedicate an enormous percentage of the tax savings to stock buybacks and only a sliver to worker compensation. That is why the Republican bill is not popular. A poll out from NBC News/Wall Street Journal—Wall Street Journal, hardly a working man’s newspaper—showed that only 27 percent of Americans think the tax cuts were a good idea. That is fitting news on tax day, one of the least popular days of the year.

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.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carlos G. Muniz, of Florida, to be General Counsel, Department of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SCHUMER, will have the floor for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, just weeks after making it harder to stop discrimination in mortgage lending, the Senate is now on the verge of voting to make it harder to stop discrimination in auto lending.

About 40 years ago, Congress passed the important civil rights law called the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. That law said companies couldn’t discriminate when offering a loan. It was a simple idea: Loan terms should be the same for creditworthy people, not on the color of someone’s skin.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is one of the Federal agencies responsible for enforcing that 40-year-old law. The CFPB found out that when auto dealers were helping customers get financing for a car loan, minority customers were often given worse loans than their White counterparts. The underlying reason was something called a dealer reserve, where the lenders providing the financing for a car loan gave the dealer discretion to mark up the interest rate on the loan and the dealer could keep some of the additional profit from the markup. The problem was the growing evidence that dealers marked up loans higher for minorities than for Whites with similar credit profiles.

In 2013, the CFPB issued guidance to these lenders about how they could make sure they were complying with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. They could institute more rigorous oversight of their auto financing process to get rid of these discriminatory practices or they could stop using the dealer reserves that facilitated these discriminatory practices and just pay dealers a flat fee per loan.

After issuing the guidance, the CFPB found that a few auto lenders were not following the guidance. It entered into settlements with Fifth Third and the financing arms of both Honda and Toyota. These settlements returned millions of dollars to people who had been charged more for car loans simply based on the color of their skin.
A lot of auto dealers and auto lenders don’t like the CFPB’s guidance, which brings us to today, when the Senate is about to vote on reversing this guidance and prohibiting the CFPB from ever issuing similar guidance again.

That is the Republican attack on the efforts to fight economic discrimination. House Republicans have passed multiple bills that would make it harder to enforce fair lending laws. Since assuming control of the Senate, Mick Mulvaney has taken steps to undermine the agency’s Office of Fair Lending.

The vote today is also a troubling followup to the recent bank deregulation bill that just passed the Senate. That bill reduced data reporting requirements for 85 percent of the banks in this country, making it harder for Federal agencies to monitor mortgage lending, uncover discrimination and enforce the law. Now the Senate is considering rolling back guidance that explains how lenders can avoid discrimination when providing auto loans.

Let’s be clear. Discrimination in auto lending is alive and well. The National Fair Housing Alliance recently sent two people—one White, one non-White—to eight car dealerships in Virginia. Even though the non-White person had better credit than the White person in each instance, the non-White person ended up with a more expensive loan half of the time. That is the story in the auto lending industry.

Unfortunately, perhaps no other body of water in the United States has been as harmed by invasive species as the Great Lakes. It is ballast water that has brought the majority of these invasive species into the Great Lakes. They are first brought in from salt water into the Great Lakes, and then they are moved around within the Great Lakes after they get there.

There last thing we should be doing is making it harder to crack down on that kind of discrimination. As a wide array of civil rights and consumer groups have written, “Discrimination in auto lending continues to extract billions of dollars a year in extra loan payments from borrowers of color; Congress should be taking action to end this injustice, not interfering with efforts to enforce fair lending laws.”

A vote in favor of the resolution today is a vote to support the Trump administration’s systemic dismantling of fair lending laws in this country. It is a vote in favor of the CFPB’s efforts to stop the CFPB’s Office of Fair Lending. It is a vote in favor of allowing some auto lenders and dealers to continue to charge African Americans and Latinos hundreds and thousands more just because of their race.

I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Thank you.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, today I rise to talk about an issue that is extremely important to my State of Michigan. In Michigan, we take great pride in the fact that we are never more than 6 miles from a body of water or more than 85 miles from one of our incredibly amazing Great Lakes.

In fact, one out of five jobs in Michigan in some way is tied to the water. We have more than 2,800 miles of shoreline. It is in our DNA in Michigan when we talk about the Great Lakes. In terms of the country, it is important for all of us to care about the Great Lakes because 95 percent of the surface fresh water in the United States is in the Great Lakes. It is 20 percent of the world’s fresh water, but 95 percent of our fresh water in the United States is in the Great Lakes. Through our Great Lakes Task Force, all the Senators and House Members around the Great Lakes have a special responsibility to step up and protect them, but we all should care because of the incredible natural resources that we have.

Unfortunately, perhaps no other body of water in the United States has been as harmed by invasive species as the Great Lakes. It is ballast water that has brought the majority of these invasive species into the Great Lakes. They are first brought in from salt water into the Great Lakes, and then they are moved around within the Great Lakes after they get there.

I am very much about legislation in front of us that would weaken our ability to protect the Great Lakes. We need to do everything we can to maintain strong ballast water standards and maintain what we need to do to protect the Great Lakes. It is incredibly important for me to speak out, along with my colleagues, about what is in front of us.

I strongly support the Coast Guard bill. In fact, I strongly support the Coast Guard Task Force to protect the Great Lakes. It is in our DNA in Michigan when we talk about the Great Lakes. Giving a de facto exemption, which is in this bill, for the vessels operating in the Great Lakes, you can look out at it. It looks like you are looking at the ocean with big barges. We call the Great Lakes, of course, the ocean without the salt or sharks. We have barges. I have been a strong supporter of the Great Lakes. They are vital to our economy, and they really do a wonderful job. But unfortunately, when we look at protecting the Great Lakes, giving a de facto exemption, which is in this bill, from these vessels ever having to be required to install ballast water control technologies is not in the interest of protecting our waters.

The good news is that, as the lakers travel within the Great Lakes, they are bringing in the salt water ballast, but, unfortunately, they move them around. We saw this with zebra and quagga mussels that were in the lower part of the Great Lakes. Unfortunately, they get moved around all the way up to Lake Superior because of the vessels that are moving. It does make a difference having those standards.

Beyond the ballast water though, one of the things that I just recently found out about this addition to the Coast Guard bill that is going in a very large way, on top of all this, is that it not only curtails State ballast water laws, but many States have regulations to limit other discharges of oils and chemicals and so on. Often times, these rules are in place to protect sensitive areas like oyster beds or oysters, which, again, are out in the salt water. For us, this is about the fact that it would remove the ability for States to regulate other harmful chemicals.

I will give you one example that is becoming a nightmare for us in Michigan. I think it will eventually be in every State. That is a runoff of a regulated type of foam that has been used
forever in fire suppression. There is a group of chemicals that they dump called PFOS. That is the acronym. We have fire suppression equipment that has been used at training facilities and others on our Air Force bases, Army bases, National Guard bases, and so on, for a long time. It is not used anymore. On the west side of Michigan, we have private companies making footwear and other kinds of products where these water-resistant chemicals have been used in all kinds of ways for a long time.

Across the country, States like Michigan are struggling to address serious contamination of drinking water caused by a chemical that has been used in this firefighting foam. At our National Guard training center, Camp Grayling in Northern Michigan—which is the largest one in the country for the National Guard—we have a beautiful lake, and we move a lot of barracks. This beautiful lake is in the middle of this very large facility. We now see this foam flowing on top of the water. For people with private property around the lake, this chemical is floating on top of the water. The townships are looking at ways that they can go from individual wells to some kind of municipal water system, but it is touching every part of Michigan. My guess is that before it is done, because these types of foams were used all over the country, we are going to see it everywhere, and we are going to have real challenges.

I am very appreciative that the Department of Defense appropriations money was added for a study to look at the broader safety issues and public health issues that relate to this so we know that the right standards are set. There are standards now, but we need to begin the process. We need to address the impact on ground water and so on. We are going to have a lot of remediation to do for the public sector as well as private sector.

Here is the problem. This bill says that States can no longer issue any regulation on the use of these foams which may contain toxic substances. It is not only ballast water that we care deeply about. States that don’t have the beautiful Great Lakes around them or our coastlines are impacted by these toxic substances that we are finding more of every day—these chemicals that were used everywhere. I am sure people thought they were safe when they used them on them. Now we are finding out they were not, and they have a huge impact.

This is especially problematic when the States—not the Federal Government—are on the frontline in addressing this crisis, many of the concerns about the impact of the ground water contamination. This bill would take away the capacity for States to be able to act. I don’t think any of the supporters of the bill intended for this to happen. Any one of the proponents of the bill have been leaders in the effort in the Senate to address these chemicals.

I urge us to take a step back, and before voting to proceed to concur with this, that we take a step back together and take a look at the broader implications of the way this language is put together. I strongly support the Coast Guard bill. I think everybody here is trying to move forward and move to_ROWS with this additional language. Certainly, I am not going to support it. Because of the ballast water concerns alone, I would not. But you add on top of that taking away the State’s capacity to be able to address these toxic chemicals that we are now finding everywhere—not only in Michigan, but across the country—and I think they will not be sending off alarm bells to everyone.

I know that Senator CARPER and the EPPW Committee have been working on a real solution to address this issue. I personally think we can do that on a bipartisan basis. I hope we will.

This is a vote, I think, that many will regret. I will regret that the Coast Guard bill, that we have PFOS—chemical contamination becomes more widespread. The firefighting foam wasn’t just used in Michigan or in a few States. It was around the country. I think taking away the State’s ability to be able to do what they need to do. We need to be able to act now. In Michigan, this has become a huge issue around this group of toxic chemicals. I would urge my colleagues to vote no on this motion. Let us go back and take another look at it and figure out some different language. Certainly, we all support the Coast Guard. If we take VIDA out and the Coast Guard bill, that is great. If we want to look at the issues around VIDA—and I appreciate the concerns around that—that’s do it in a way that makes sense for the people we represent and the States who need to be able to act now. In Michigan, this has become a huge issue around this group of toxic chemicals.

I urge a “no” vote. Whenever we vote—I believe it may be tomorrow—I hope that we take a step back and work together on this right. 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. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today is the last tax day under the old, awful, and broken tax system that the American people have had to put up with for decades.

Under the tax relief law that Republicans passed in this body in December—it was signed by President Trump and passed the House, as well—we now have a simpler and fairer system and, so importantly, one that is much less expensive for employers to be able to address these challenges.

One big thing we did in the tax law was to double the standard deduction that people can take. This is what it means. This one change alone, all by itself, means that 95 percent of taxpayers will be taking the standard deduction from now on. It means people will not have to waste a lot of time wading through paperwork and boxes of receipts. People will not have to worry about after-tax income—little itemized deductions, as they have done year after year on tax day. They will not just be crossing their fingers, hoping they are doing everything right, hoping they don’t overpay, and hoping they aren’t underpaying. And it’s not just about the money that is required by law. It is going to be much simpler and much fairer.

When I thought of all of the things we have been working on with tax relief, tax reform, tax reductions, to me, it can be summed up in just two words: simpler and lower. Taxes needed to be lower, and they needed to be simpler. So what we are seeing now is both simpler and lower taxes. That is a big change that people are going to notice. They are noticing it now in their paychecks, but they are really going to notice it next April when they file their taxes.

Americans will not have to wait until next April to see a lot of the benefits of this tax relief law. They are seeing it today because the law wasn’t just tax reform and simplification; it was an immediate, big tax cut as well. It means hard-working Americans are seeing money in their paychecks, and they are seeing it today.

Average wages have gone up nearly 3 percent. That is a big increase compared to the stagnant wage growth we have seen with raises announced across the country. It all adds up to about $200 billion more for hard-working Americans.

That is money people can then spend on things that are important to them and their families. It is about American families’ priorities, not necessarily how the government thinks it can spend its money better than the American people. It is money people can save for things such as tuition for their kids, a new car, or whatever they want to save for. People notice that kind of difference in their take-home pay. It makes a big difference in their lives.

Another thing that happens when we cut taxes is that businesses have more money to hire more workers. I have seen it happen in Wyoming. I have seen it as I travel the State. In city after city, town after town, community after
community, businesses are hiring more workers locally. In fact, the American economy has added over 600,000 new jobs just since Republicans passed and President Trump signed the tax law in December.

These are jobs at places like Kroger. That grocery store chain—and they have a number of convenience stores, as well, serving all around Wyoming—said last week that they are going to be hiring 11,000 new workers. Those aren’t just people at headquarters; these stores all around the country—cashiers, produce clerks, workers in prepared food sections of the store. It is good for the American economy and good for the communities where these people are being hired.

If someone has money in their pocket, they can decide to spend some of it, give some to charity, invest some, or save some—whatever they want to do. It is their money.

In some of the stores similar to Kroger in Cheyenne, Casper, Gillette, Rock Springs—but we are seeing it all around the country—stores are hiring more people. They are increasing benefits for people who want to continue their education or get a GED. All of these things are benefiting our country. The companies say it is directly because they are saving money under the tax law.

We have heard this story again and again. You have heard it in your State, and I have heard it in mine. These are the hiring because they are saving more money under the tax law.

A lot of companies are paying more because they want to hold on to the workers they have. That is one reason the initial jobless claims number for the first week of April has dropped. The claims of people who are out of work and have filed for benefits from the government have dropped by 9,000 people. That is a sign that people are keeping their jobs and don’t need to apply for unemployment benefits.

The number of jobless claims has been low now for the longest stretch ever. They have been keeping records since 1967, and nobody has ever seen it like this.

One economist looked at all the good news and said: “The job market is ripping roaring.” The American people don’t need an economist to tell them that. All they need to do is look around their own neighborhood or at home in Wyoming. Businesses are hiring. Workers are getting bonuses. They are getting raises. They are seeing more money in their paychecks. People all across America are feeling better about their jobs. I see confidence and optimism at home. People are feeling better about their own personal financial situation. It is certainly the case at home in Wyoming.

There have been a couple of surveys that have been heard lately, particularly of them. The Pew Research Center found that the number of people who say that this economy is in good or excellent condition is now the highest it has been in two decades—20 years. That is the confidence of the American people in the economy.

In a second survey, the polling firm Gallup found that investor optimism is at “the highest levels . . . in 17 years.” When we talk to investors, we are talking about families in Wyoming who are saving for their retirement. They have seen the effects of Republican policies like the tax relief law. They have seen what we are doing to make sure the economy can continue to grow, so people can be free to live their lives and make decisions for themselves. They have seen what happens when Washington starts to put America first again. All of those things, added together, make people confident in our economy, and it gives them optimism for the future.

The only people who aren’t feeling optimistic right now are the Democrats in Congress who, across the board, voted against this tax relief law. Republicans voted to lower taxes, and Democrats voted for higher taxes. Now Democrats seem to be desperately trying to spin their way out of the terrible choices that they made.

Over the weekend, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, NANCY PELOSI, said that the Republican tax cuts “are unfair to America’s working families.” Who is she kidding? The only thing that would be if Democrats get their wish and repeal the tax cuts that we passed and raise taxes, which apparently is what they want to do.

I have spoken to a lot of working families at home in Wyoming. They are overjoyed at the extra money they have gotten in their paychecks since the Republicans cut taxes. Americans know that the economy has created 600,000 new jobs since we passed tax reform. They are breaking records for low numbers of people filing for unemployment. People see that the average wages are up—much higher for unemployment. They know we are breaking the Republicans cut taxes. Americans have gotten in their paychecks since the Republicans cut taxes, which apparently is what they want to do.

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.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, as millions of Americans in Illinois and across the Nation finish filing their taxes, I come to the floor to discuss the most recent tax reform bill considered by the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

Last year, Republicans followed through with their promise and used a special procedural approach called reconciliation, which allowed them to bring a tax reform plan to the floor outside of regular order and without committee hearings. The ordinary amendment-invoked process. Democrats were not really participants in this but only observers, under the reconciliation process. That tax plan has now become the law of the land, and now we know what it is doing. It has created a massive tax giveaway to the largest multinational corporations, to the wealthiest corporate CEOs, and to well-connected campaign donors.

In passing this plan, Republicans said that the tax cuts were enough for large corporations, these corporations would invest in America, give breaks to their employees, and create more employment. The benefits of these tax breaks to the corporations would supposedly trickle down to workers in the form of higher wages, and the economy would explode, creating new jobs.

The tax plan was voted on favorably by every Republican in the U.S. Senate, and it added $1.5 trillion to the national debt, to fund these massive corporate tax cuts. So what did the corporations do with their tax cut benefits? They turned around and took them for lawyer-funded stock buybacks—far outpacing the rate of companies announcing one-time bonuses to their workers. That number was that, but more than 100,000 employees in large corporations have actually been terminated. You couldn’t get further from tax relief for working families if you tried.

It gets worse. The Congressional Budget Office reported last week that the Republican tax plan will actually cost another $300 billion beyond the $1.5 trillion estimate. Our children and grandchildren will pay off the cost of these tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America and the largest corporations. So much for the promise that these tax cuts would pay for themselves. It will cost us roughly $1.9 trillion over 10 years for these tax cuts for major corporations and wealthy people. This is a burden our children and grandchildren will bear.

So what are we hearing now when it comes to the budget? Just last week, and seeing that the rich that voted for was expected to add $1.9 trillion to the deficit, Republican Tennessee Senator CORKER said: “If it ends up costing what has been laid out here, it could well be one of the worst votes I’ve made.”

The so-called fiscal conservatives here in the Senate didn’t seem as concerned about the deficit when they
were voting for a 10-figure increase that would go to cut taxes for wealthy people and large corporations. But make no mistake—as predictably as night follows day, we now have a renewed call in the House of Representatives for an amendment—a constitutional, balanced budget, “stop me before I sin again” amendment. Now that Republicans have exploded the deficit, the absolutely vital public assistance programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are now at risk. If there is a balanced budget amendment, they have said that we have to get to the basic programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid to make up the difference. I think it is unconscionable to give tax breaks to people who are well off and comfortably and to stand by them in protecting a major asset. The lake is the primary freshwater supply that some special interest wants to sell. It really is a beautiful city and seen that lakefront and realized the impact it has on the most. Millions of people visit Lake Michigan every year. They swim, kayak, and have little picnics. It really is a major asset. The lake is the primary source of drinking water for more than 10 million people not just in Illinois but in Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, and many other States. Together, the Great Lakes support a multibillion-dollar fishing industry, dozens of local economies, and thousands of small businesses. However, the Coast Guard reauthorization bill, which could come before the Senate as early as tomorrow, will do irreversible damage to the Great Lakes, and I am urging my colleagues to oppose it.

It is not uncommon in this Chamber for Members from each State to stand up from time to time and tell a story to their colleagues about something in their State of great personal value to them and to plead with their colleagues to understand what this means and to stand by them in protecting a great natural resource or a great natural asset.

The bill itself—the Coast Guard reauthorization—I don’t have a problem with. It does a lot of good things for an important part of our military service. It helps equip the Coast Guard with the tools they are going to need so they can keep us safe and be part of the critical homeland security mission. There is, however, one provision in the bill that should reprogram all of this.

This bill was reported by the Commerce Committee. One of the provisions in this bill should never have started in the Commerce Committee; it should be in the Environment Committee. That is VIDA, the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act, or VIDA. This provision in the Coast Guard reauthorization bill will undermine the Clean Water Act just to give a generous deal to one specific industry. VIDA exempts the shipping industry from being regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Clean Water Act. It places it instead under the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard is a great organization, and there are great people serving there. The Coast Guard, however, has no expertise in setting standards for clean water; the Environmental Protection Agency has that responsibility. This bill takes that responsibility away from the EPA.

This bill also preempts the States and their rights to implement their own standards that would meet specific needs and limits the public’s ability to seek action in court.

Who opposes this bill? The attorney general of the State of Illinois, as well as the attorneys general from New York, California, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington, so far.

The bill’s supporters say all of this is necessary to establish a uniform national standard, but the bill doesn’t do that. Instead, it cuts a big Great Lakes-sized doughnut hole out of its own standard and exempts ships operating on the Great Lakes from meeting the same “best available control technology” standard that all other ships are required to meet. It is a sweet-heart deal for shippers on the Great Lakes.

VIDA also makes it almost impossible for anyone to ever require ships operating on the Great Lakes to install new pollution controls in the future. This means these ships would likely never be required to use any available technology to prevent the spread of invasive species like zebra mussels, blood red shrimp, and Asian carp.

I can’t tell you how much money we have spent to stop the Asian carp from invading the Great Lakes. We think it is going to destroy the Great Lakes as a marine habitat if we are not careful, and we have stopped them so far. This irresponsible measure as part of the Coast Guard reauthorization goes in exactly the opposite direction. It opens the door for invasive species invading our Great Lakes through ballast water. That is unacceptable.

Chicagoland deserves to know that ships operating on Lake Michigan are using the best technology available to prevent the discharge of harmful chemicals into their primary drinking water and invasive species, but the bill’s exemptions go far beyond the Great Lakes.

Another provision of VIDA would prevent the States from enforcing standards to stop the shipping industry from releasing fluorinated chemicals into the lakes and oceans across the country. Many of my colleagues have become familiar with chemicals like PFAS and PFOA—after they contaminated critical groundwater sources in their own States.

As the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I can’t tell you how many colleagues from all across the United States have now discovered that these perfluorinated chemicals are a danger to their drinking supply and a public health hazard. They come to me begging for Federal funds to clean up the messes at military bases and airports. Now we are considering a bill on the floor that weakens the standard for release of those chemicals into our water supply. What are we thinking? Is the shipping industry worth that much that we turn our backs on this public health hazard?

I have seen how the military has used these chemicals over the years for legitimate purposes like firefighting. Now we are going to spend millions of dollars cleaning them up, and this Coast Guard bill is going to make it worse. Allowing the commercial shipping industry to freely release these chemicals into bodies of water without proper oversight is downright disgusting.

All of these reasons are why more than 115 environmental organizations have announced their opposition to this Coast Guard bill. It has nothing to do with the Coast Guard—we value them; we treasure them; we want to help them—but to slip this provision in, this environmental rider which endangers the water supply for millions of Americans, is just wrong.

Despite all these objections, Senator MCCONNELL now wants to bring this bill to the floor in a way that will limit debate, doesn’t allow for any amendments to change it, and provides no pathway to improve the bill or to delete this terrible provision. This is not how to consider an issue that is so important with so many people concerned about it.

I urge my colleagues, when this measure of the Coast Guard reauthorization comes up for a vote on cloture on concurrence, to vote no.

Today it is the Great Lakes. Tomorrow it is your backyard, it is your water supply that some special interest group will want to contaminate in the name of more profits. We can do better. We owe it to our kids to do better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Arizona.
the decision of the President of the United States to order precision missile strikes on three facilities in Syria last Friday night.

This action demonstrates American leadership in the face of gross human rights violations and, as we all recall, President Obama’s redline, which was not enforced, which indeed is a provocation in and of itself.

I am glad this President has seen fit now, not just once but on two occasions, to push the Syrian regime for such gross human rights violations. These actions are consistent with our values and legal authorities provided to the President under the Constitution. They are similar to decisions made by Presidents Clinton and Obama in Kosovo and Libya.

While not unprecedented, clearly what occurred is very serious. So I want to take just a few moments to explain why I think the strikes were justified and were the appropriate course of action taken against the Assad regime.

What we now know is, the Syrian government, on April 7, attacked civilians in the city of Duma, killing at least 70 and injuring 500 more. To carry out this attack, they used chlorine, sarin gas, and sarin gas against its own people. We know this because credible medical personnel—including the World Health Organization—reported physical symptoms that indicated they had been exposed. People were convulsing in the streets, their nervous systems were attacked, their pupils were constricted, all telltale signs of these chemicals.

When civilians suffer in this way, there is nothing normal or acceptable about it—even in a country grappling with a brutal civil war. That Bashar al-Assad inflicted these crimes on his own people makes them even darker and more insidious.

Chemical weapons have long been the kind of redline in the realm of armed, international conflict. After World War I, the 1925 Geneva Protocol banned chemical and biological weapons because they are different in kind from guns, sabers, and bombs.

One reason they are different is because of the suffering they inflict on their victims. Another reason is because of their indiscriminate nature. Gases, by their very nature, are impossible to control. They spread in the atmosphere. You can’t quarantine gas in an enclosed area. People who were exposed by the same substance, or by different substances, were the appropriate course of action.

The President’s decision to send National Guard troops to the border displays a continued interest to secure the border. To take care of that aspect, last month, I offered legislation to extend DACA for 3 years and to provide 3 years of increased funding for border security—this so-called 3-for-3 plan. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues have repeatedly chosen to block this measure from coming to the floor, but the President’s decision to send National Guard troops to the border displays a continued interest to secure the border.

These young immigrants were brought here through no fault of their own. They have waited long enough for these protections. Likewise, border communities, like in my home State of Arizona, have waited long enough for increased security along our southern border.

As I have said before, we in Congress have too regularly confused action with results and have been entirely too comfortable ignoring problems that are just actually tough to solve. We may not have delivered a permanent solution to these problems at this time, but we now have an opportunity to offer at least some action on them. There are many people whose lives and well-being depend on our ability to deliver meaningful results.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 300, H.R. 1551. I further ask that the Flake substitute amendment at the desk 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. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally.

The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to offer some remarks on
our constituents are seeing signs that the law is positive and has wide-reaching effects. I, like the Presiding Officer, my colleague from Texas, have spoken to many of those families and businesses, both great and small. Some of the most recent ones I talked to were in College Station. One of the folks I spoke to was a woman by the name of Claudia Smith. Claudia owns and operates a small mom-and-pop flooring business. She told me that tax reform has impacted her company in many ways.

The first is that, with more money in their pockets, her customers feel more optimistic. They are more willing to make purchases that for years before they had been putting off. The second is that Claudia is using her tax savings to hire more employees and buy expensive equipment that previously the company could not afford.

The third way the changes are helping Claudia is that she is able to sleep a little more soundly at night. In years past, one thing that kept her up was the rising cost of health insurance. Because of the size of her business, Claudia has never been required to provide it, but since she considers her coworkers to be her family, health insurance is something she felt obligated to offer. When she did her annual budgeting each year, health insurance was often on the chopping block—something she just couldn’t afford. Up until the very last minute, Claudia was never sure whether she would be able to keep offering it. Now, thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, she feels more confident in her ability to provide not only health insurance for the foreseeable future but other new employee benefits as well.

Claudia’s is a great story—not because it is unique but because it is typical of the sort of response I have heard across my State when it comes to the benefits of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Although I am very glad that last fall we were able to pass the first major overhaul of the Tax Code in more than 30 years, now is not the time to let up. We can’t stop fighting for taxpayers like Claudia. In fact, today I am reintroducing the Small Business Taxpayer Bill of Rights Act, legislation that reduces redtape for taxpayers and allows small businesses to spend more time growing and creating jobs and less time dealing with burdensome IRS procedures and improper targeting practices. I am proud to have my colleague, the senior Senator from Nevada, as my colleague to do what is best for our constituents.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today on tax day to recognize this as the very last time Americans will have to file their taxes under the complicated, burdensome, outdated system of the past. Today, we officially kick off a new tax code—one that is simpler, fairer, and allows hard-working Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money.

Since we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act last December, success stories have poured into my office from Indiana businesses that are paying their workers more and from constituents who are earning more. Tax reform has provided needed relief across Indiana and across the entire country. To date, we have found scores of companies in my home State of Indiana that have invested in their employees, invested in capital improvements, or lowered energy rates for consumers. We should not be arming her with more power to undermine the very last time Americans will have to file their taxes under the IRS’s legal actions weren’t substantively justified. I hope we can act on this legislation soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, I know the leader plans to make a motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 57, the auto lending CRA, at 2:15 p.m., and we will have a rollcall vote on that motion.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwith-}

standing rule XXII, if applicable, at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, April 18, the Senate resume consideration of the Muniz nomination, with 1 hour of debate remaining, equally divided between Senator GILLIBRAND or her designees and Senator ALEXANDER or his designee, on the floor. Following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the nomination as under the previous order; finally, that the Senate now proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate now proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today on tax day to recognize this as the very last time Americans will have to file their taxes under the complicated, burdensome, outdated system of the past. Today, we officially kick off a new tax code—one that is simpler, fairer, and allows hard-working Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money.

Since we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act last December, success stories have poured into my office from Indiana businesses that are paying their workers more and from constituents who are earning more. Tax reform has provided needed relief across Indiana and across the entire country. To date, we have found scores of companies in my home State of Indiana that have invested in their employees, invested in capital improvements, or lowered energy rates for consumers. They range in size from large companies, such as Family Express, which has 70 convenience stores across the State and is building 10 more and increasing its starting wage. We feel obligated to pass with significant part of the tax savings to our staff,” said Family Express president and CEO Gus Olympidis.
My guest to this year’s State of the Union Address was another beneficiary of this historic tax overhaul. Chelsea Hatfield is a young mother of three children and a teller at a rural branch of First Farmers Bank & Trust in Tipton, IN. Chelsea received a raise and a bonus as a result of this tax reform effort. This additional income will help Chelsea go back to school to earn her associate’s degree. It will enable her to put money away for her children’s future college education. Chelsea represents so many Americans who work in small towns and who live in our rural communities and are going to get a fair shot because of the benefits from tax reform.

The tax reform success stories don’t stop there. NIPSCO, or the Northern Indiana Public Service Company, is an electric utility company in Merrillville, IN. It is passing on $26 million in new savings to its customers. Andy Mark, a mechanical and electrical engineer in Kokomo, is hiring more employees. Muncie Aviation Company is providing tax reform bonuses for all of its employees. One Hoosier, who lives in Cedar Lake, IN, is growing his third-generation milk-hauling business, and another, who lives in Southern Indiana and works for U-Haul in Louisville, used his $500 tax bonus to pay a bill. These bonuses and raises are allowing more Hoosiers to save for a rainy day, to put more money away towards their child’s education, to make repairs to their home, and to keep food on the table.

It is worth noting that when we were debating tax reform, I listened carefully to feedback from my constituents across Indiana. I spent a lot of time traveling the State, holding roundtables, visiting businesses, and traveling the State, holding roundtables, visiting businesses, and traveling the State, holding roundtables, visiting businesses, and talking to folks on the street. I am glad to say that Hoosier voices were heard, and they are receiving the tax relief they asked for. I look forward to continue hearing Hoosiers’ tax reform stories so like the rest of America, I look forward to this being the last day of the old, outdated tax system.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BLUNT).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 378, S.J. Res. 57, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to ‘‘Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.’’

Mr. MCCONNELL, I ask for the yeas and nays. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Enzi
Enzi
Fischer
Flake
Gardner
Graham
Greenley
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hirono
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kennedy
Kisch
Kyrillos
Lankford
Lee
Manchin
McConnell
Merkel
Merkel
Merkel
Merkel
Merkel
Reed
Sanders
Schacht
Scham
Shaneen
Smith
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Tulsi
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—47

Balbun
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booher
Brown
Cumici
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Gillibrand
Harriss
Hatfield

Not Voting—3

Duckworth
McCain
Tillis

The motion was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAl OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. J. Res. 57, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to ‘‘Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.’’

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my support for Senator MORAN and Senator TOOMEY’s resolution using the Congressional Review Act to disapprove of the CFPB’s 2013 auto finance guidance.

It is important that Congress disapprove this guidance because it was an attempt by the CFPB to make substantial policy changes through guidance rather than through the rule-making process governed by the Administrative Procedure Act. It was also an attempt to regulate auto dealers who were explicitly exempted from the CFPB’s supervision and regulation under the Dodd-Frank Act.

According to an internal CFPB memo, the CFPB rejected developing a rule using its statutory authority to regulate unfair, deceptive, and abusive acts and practices because “the potentially unfair, deceptive, or abusive actions are ostensibly those of dealers, over whom we have no regulatory authority.”

As the Wall Street Journal editorial board noted, “That didn’t stop former CFPB chief Richard Cordray, who used the back door of auto-financing to regulate dealers.”

Make no mistake—the CFPB’s decision to develop guidance instead of a rule was intentionally aimed at Senator TOOMEY’s request, the Government Accountability Office evaluated the bulletin to see if it should have been submitted to Congress as required by the Congressional Review Act.

The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. MURDOCK. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Enzi
Enzi
Fischer
Flake
Gardner
Graham
Greenley
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hirono
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kennedy
Kisch
Kyrillos
Lankford
Lee
Manchin
McConnell
Merkel
Merkel
Merkel
Merkel
Merkel
Reed
Sanders
Schacht
Scham
Shaneen
Smith
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Tulsi
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—47

Balbun
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booher
Brown
Cumici
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Gillibrand
Harriss
Hatfield

Not Voting—3

Duckworth
McCain
Tillis
voice to the process and have historically been used by Federal agencies to simply restate existing law to aid covered companies’ compliance.

The CFPB’s indirect auto bulletin represents a departure from typical Federal agency practice, as reflected in the GAO’s conclusion that it is a rule subject to CRA requirements.

Without the opportunity for public comment and the ability for the bulletin to be revised to avoid any unintended consequences, auto dealers’ incentive to act as an intermediary has been greatly diminished. As a result, consumers will be inconvenienced and have fewer and more expensive financing options when shopping for a vehicle.

Some people opposed to this resolution are concerned about what this means for regulatory guidance more generally. I would note that almost all guidance issued by agencies may qualify as a rule under the Congressional Review Act’s definition of a rule, which only takes into account that it is a rule subject to CRA requirements.

In light of such significant concerns, the House introduced legislation in 2015 to nullify the effect of the bulletin and place guardrails around the development of any future indirect auto lending guidance. Unfortunately, that bill, which was substantially the same as the one it just tried to issue, did not pass.

The guidance is harmful because it pressures vehicle finance companies to limit consumers’ ability to receive discounted auto loans from dealers. Furthermore, the guidance threatens to raise credit costs and push marginally creditworthy consumers out of the vehicle financing market, and has the potential to harm the vehicle industry and its associated U.S. jobs.

The independent Community Bankers of America and the Independent Auto Dealers Association, the National Association of Automotive Dealers, the National Independent Auto Dealers Association, the National Auto Auction Association, the Recreational Vehicle Industry Association, and the Motorcycle Industry Council, all expressing their strong support for S.J. Res. 57.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:


DEAR SENATOR: The American Financial Services Association (AFSA) writes to express our strong support for S.J. Res. 57, which would rescind the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s (CFPB) 2013 vehicle finance guidance. The guidance is harmful to American consumers and businesses, and the CFPB acted without accountability in its issuance of the guidance.

The guidance is harmful because it pressures vehicle finance companies to limit consumers’ ability to receive discounted auto loans from dealers. Furthermore, the guidance threatens to raise credit costs and push marginally creditworthy consumers out of the vehicle financing market, and has the potential to harm the vehicle industry and its associated U.S. jobs.

The Bureau issued the guidance without any public comment, consultation with CFPB’s sister agencies, or transparency. The CFPB issued the policy, which directed fundamental market changes, without a transparent rulemaking process to assess the impact on consumers.

In the 114th Congress, the House overwhelmingly approved H.R. 1737, the “Reforming CFPB Indirect Auto Financing Guidance Act,” a bill rejecting the vehicle finance guidance similar to S.J. Res 57. The legislation passed the House by a bipartisan vote of 332-96, including 88 Democrats.

Res. 57 is a narrow resolution that preserves fair lending protections. It does not hinder enforcement of fair lending laws or regulations, which AFSA and its members strongly support. In fact, even the House Financial Services Committee minority report accompanying H.R. 1737 stated that, “H.R. 1737 does not alter regulated entities’ obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (ECOA) or the CFPB’s examination or enforcement activity pursuant to ECOA.”

Proponents of S.J. Res. 57 take fair credit laws very seriously, and the resolution protects these laws and their enforcement to safeguard equal opportunity in vehicle financing.

Please lend your support S.J. Res. 57, both as a cosponsor and an affirmative vote on the Senate floor. If you need more information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

BILL HIMPLER,
Executive Vice President,
American Financial Services Association.

NATIONAL AUTOMOTIVE DEALERS ASSOCIATION, Tysons, VA, April 13, 2018.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL, Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER, Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL AND LEADER SCHUMER: On behalf of America’s 16,500 franchised new car and truck dealers and the 1.1 million people they employ, I am writing in strong support of S.J. Res. 57, a joint resolution providing for Congressional disapproval of a rule by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) relating to indirect auto lending. Despite Congress exempting
most auto dealers from the CFPB’s jurisdiction under Section 1029 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, the CFPB’s rule, issued as “guidance,” increase market competition and take away a consumer’s ability to receive a discounted auto loan in the showroom. Access to affordable credit is essential to consumers’ ability of a consumer to receive a discount on auto credit is often necessary to meet auto buyers’ needs.

S.J. Res. 57 is a narrowly-tailored joint resolution that does not amend or change any fair credit law or regulation or impair their enforcement. The legislation is a measured response to the CFPB’s attempt to regulate auto financing practices, avoid congressional scrutiny by issuing “guidance,” and impose a new policy without necessary procedural safeguards. Congress has considered this issue thoroughly over the past several years through oversight and legislative action. The Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee raised the matter during two CFPB oversight hearings. Moreover, by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 332–96, including 80% of Democrats and Republicans, the House passed H.R. 1737, the “Reforming CFPB Indirect Auto Financing Guidance Act,” which would have rescinded the CFPB auto finance guidance.

The extensive bipartisan congressional engagement has identified several reasons to disapprove the CFPB rule/guidance, including a lack of adequate notice, opportunity for public comment, and lack of consultation with the federal agencies or Congress over dealers.

Indirect auto lenders were pressured by the rule/guidance to eliminate a consumer’s ability to receive a discount on auto credit by a dealer, which would have fundamentally altered the entire auto finance market. This new policy would have limited market competition, raised credit costs for auto buyers, and thereby pushed some marginally credit-worthy borrowers out of the credit market. The CFPB admitted to the Senate that it did not analyze the impact of the rule/guidance on consumers.

Despite Congress’ clear determination in Dodd-Frank to place regulatory oversight of auto credit in the Federal Reserve Board, Federal Trade Commission and Department of Justice (DOJ), the rule/guidance assumed the CFPB could unilaterally assert jurisdiction over dealer discounts and the manner of dealer compensation for auto credit. The rule/guidance was based on a flawed method for identifying the background of consumers that relied solely on a borrower’s zip code and last name. A non-partisan study of the CFPB’s policy found a 41 percent error rate for claims regarding the backgrounds of a significant group of consumers, and even the CFPB’s own review revealed a 20 percent error rate for the same group. This non-partisan study was never rebuted by the CFPB.

The rule/guidance failed to account for legitimate business factors that can affect finance rates (such as discounting a rate due to the presence of a competing offer or to accommodate a consumer’s monthly budget constraints) to ensure that borrowers being compared are similarly situated.

The auto industry takes fair credit laws very seriously and strongly condemns discrimination in the provision of this consumer protection. NADA, joined by the other national dealer associations, developed and continues to promote a voluntary fair-credit compliance program, based on an effective DOJ model that preserves consumer discounts on credit for legitimate business reasons. Unfortunately, the CFPB’s change work with the Federal regulators that have jurisdiction over dealers, failed to adopt the DOJ-based fair credit alternative as an appropriate method of protecting fair credit risks in indirect auto lending.

Enactment of S.J. Res. 57 is important to keep auto loans affordable and accessible for consumers and small business dealers. In particular:

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER:

On behalf of the members of the American Bankers Association (ABA), I write to express our support for S. J. Res. 57, a resolution to disapprove the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection’s (CFPB) 2013 auto financing rule. S.J. Res. 57 follows the U.S. Government Accountability Office’s (GAO) determination that the “guidance” outlined in the Bulletin was intended to address. In fact, internal documents demonstrate that even Bureau staff found the data and methodology intended to support the rule “unsupportable.”

We thank Senator Moran and Senator Toomey for their leadership to resolve this overreach by the Bureau and for engaging the Government Accountability Office (GAO), which determined on December 5, 2017, that the Bulletin is in fact a “rule” for purposes of the Congressional Review Act.

Moreover, we applaud the work of the House Financial Services Committee, which released three reports on the topic.

The Chamber believes the Bulletin—like all other federal agencies—should follow the Administrative Procedure Act when issuing guidance and promulgating regulations. Administrative actions should be based on clear legislative authority, solid data, and proper public input. That is why the Chamber strongly supports the Portman-Heitkamp Regulatory Accountability Act, which would modernize the rulemaking and guidance processes for the first time since 1946.

The Chamber urges you to reject the Bureau’s Bulletin and to support S.J. Res. 57.

Sincerely,

JACK HOWARD,
Senior Vice President,
Congressional and Public Affairs.

INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY BANKERS OF AMERICA*,
Washington, DC, April 17, 2018.
Hon. Mitch McConnell,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. Charles Schumer,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER:

On behalf of the nearly 5,700 community banks represented by the Independent Community Bankers of America, I urge the Senate to support S.J. Res. 57, a joint resolution under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) introduced by Sen. Jerry Moran (R-Kan.) to overturn the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s (CFPB) 2013 auto finance guidance set forth in CFPB Bulletin No. 2013–02, titled “Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.”

A resolution under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) has the force of the law, and required voting consideration by the House of Representatives.

ABA urges the Senate to adopt S.J. Res. 57.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. BALLENGE,
Senior Vice President,
Congressional and Public Affairs.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, April 17, 2018.

TO MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE:

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce urges you to support S.J. Res. 57, a Congressional Review Act resolution to undo the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection’s action on CFPB Bulletin No. 2013–02, “Indirect Auto Lending,” which will establish that indirect lenders—firms that are never face-to-face with borrowers and only purchase contracts after-the-fact from auto dealers—can be liable for discrimination.

The Chamber abhors discrimination in all its forms, including in the financial service and auto lending sectors.

However, the Bureau provided little concrete evidence of the problem that the Bulletin was intended to address. In fact, internal documents demonstrate that even Bureau staff found the data and methodology intended to support the rule “unsupportable.”

We thank Senator Moran and Senator Toomey for their leadership to resolve this overreach by the Bureau and for engaging the Government Accountability Office (GAO), which determined on December 5, 2017, that the Bulletin is in fact a “rule” for purposes of the Congressional Review Act.

Moreover, we applaud the work of the House Financial Services Committee, which released three reports on the topic.

The Chamber believes the Bulletin—like all other federal agencies—should follow the Administrative Procedure Act when issuing guidance and promulgating regulations. Administrative actions should be based on clear legislative authority, solid data, and proper public input. That is why the Chamber strongly supports the Portman-Heitkamp Regulatory Accountability Act, which would modernize the rulemaking and guidance processes for the first time since 1946.

The Chamber urges you to reject the Bureau’s Bulletin and to support S.J. Res. 57.

Sincerely,

CAMILLE R. NIECE,
Senior Vice President,
Congressional and Public Affairs.

WASHINGTON, DC.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE
April 17, 2018

DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned organizations which represent businesses that make, sell, finance, auction and service vehicles across our country, respectfully urge your support for S.J. Res. 57, a joint resolution to disapprove the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s (CFPB) 2013 auto finance guidance. The CFPB guidance pressures indirect auto lenders to limit a consumer’s ability to receive a discounted auto loan from a dealer, resulting in less competition, higher financing rates, and loss of credit access for many vehicle buyers.

Access to affordable credit, including a dealer’s ability to discount credit, is essential to meet the transportation needs of our customers. Since more than 80 percent of vehicle purchases are financed, adequate retail credit is vital to facilitate vehicle sales. The current system allows consumers and dealers’ access to multiple lending institutions frequently allows dealers to help consumers, including the marginally credit worthy who often prefer lower interest rates, secure financing at competitive interest rates.

The CFPB auto lending policy, issued through a guidance, directed fundamental market changes without a transparent rulemaking process to assess the impact on consumers. This guidance was issued without any public comment, consultation with CFPB stakeholders (including those Congress authorized to regulate auto dealers), or transparency. Indeed, by the CFPB’s own admission, the agency did not study the impact of its guidance on consumers.

This controversial guidance also enabled the agency to skirt Congress’ express prohibition on its exercise of authority over auto, recreational vehicle, and motorcycle retailers engaged in indirect lending, (Sec. 1029(a) of Dodd-Frank). Under the Dodd-Frank law dealing with CFPB’s authority (including those Congress authorized to regulate auto dealers), or transparency. Indeed, by the CFPB’s own admission, the agency did not study the impact of its guidance on consumers.

This bulletin limits the ability of auto dealers to offer auto loans to their customers and was not issued pursuant to notice-and-comment rulemaking, as required by the CFPB failed to allow the public to comment before it made significant changes to an important sector of the financial services industry. This ruling also violates the CFPB’s own rule-making process established by Congress. Disapproving this bulletin, therefore, would provide consumers with multiple financing options and vessels to choose the loan that is best for their needs.

One of the creatures of the passage of Dodd-Frank was the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). The CFPB’s efforts to regulate indirect auto lending.

I think the chairman, the Senator from Idaho, did a great job of explaining this resolution. Today, we have the authority to reject the decision that was made by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and I hope my colleagues will join me in doing so. I have introduced this resolution to accomplish that.

Senator Toomey has made clear by his efforts that this guidance that was issued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is subject to a CRA, and that is our mission today—to accomplish the passage of that CRA.

While the chairman was speaking, I jotted down perhaps four or five points that I would like to make to my colleagues. One is that those who lend money to someone buying an automobile had nothing to do with the financial collapse that occurred as a result of the mortgage crisis in 2007 and 2008.

I think Republicans probably made a mistake—I could take out the political word “probably.” Republicans made a mistake in saying “We are going to repeal Dodd-Frank,” and Democrats responded by saying “You are never going to touch Dodd-Frank.” As a result, since 2008, we have been unable to correct, in a bipartisan way, the problem that we were creating.

Mr. MORAN. 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. MORAN. Mr. President, I am here to lend my support to a measure that I have had the honor of working on with the Senator from Pennsylvania. Tom Toomey worked side by side with the chairman of the Banking Committee—of which I am a member—the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO. I very much appreciate the leadership that both of those individuals and my other colleagues have provided over a long period of time on this issue.

Dodd-Frank was passed as a result of the concerns that many had across the country and here in the Congress regarding the financial challenges that our Nation faced resulting from mortgagel those that were sold. It really was a Wall Street crisis that, in so many ways, became challenging for Main Street, with Main Street having the consequence of having the difficulties that[p. 6] happened on Wall Street, and in so many instances, consumers ended up paying the price. But as we tried to correct the problem when Dodd-Frank was passed, it got way beyond the culprit those who were responsible for creating the financial crisis in our Nation—and began to penalize those who had nothing to do with them.

One of the creations of the passage of Dodd-Frank was the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). One of the aspects of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was their effort to regulate indirect auto lending.

The CFPB’s 2013 auto finance guidance. The CFPB rebuffed extensive industry efforts to work together to fashion a solution that would preserve discounted auto loans by dealers within the parameters of the DOJ-based model. In addition, the CFPB continued to pressure finance sources to limit a dealer’s ability to discount credit, based on a deeply flawed method for measuring lender compliance with fair lending laws. S.J. Res. 57 is narrow and purely a process resolution that removes existing restrictions and does not hinder enforcement of fair lending laws or regulations. In fact, even the House Financial Services Committee minority report accompanying H.R. 1737 stated that “H.R. 1737 does not alter regulated entities’ obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.” Proponents of S.J. Res. 57 take fair credit laws very seriously, and this joint resolution protects these laws and their enforcement to safeguard equal opportunity in vehicle financing.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
touch it.” Therefore, the consumers—the citizens of this country—have struggled and been damaged by the consequences of Dodd-Frank.

Today we are dealing with a specific provision, and that is the indirect automobile lending—a circumstance in which financing is arranged by someone who sells an automobile in their business to make the deal work for the consumer who wants to buy the automobile. It would outline these five points: First of all, this ought to be a relatively easy decision because automobile dealers are specifically excluded from the provisions of Dodd-Frank. So, in my view, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau had to work its magic to try to find a way to regulate the financing of automobiles that were arranged for by the automobile dealer in contravention to the law which says that automobile dealers are not covered by it.

I was in the Senate at the time this amendment was offered. It was offered here in the U.S. Senate by my predecessor, Senator Brownback, and adopted as a provision in Dodd-Frank. It is very specific.

I just read the language of the exemption, the exclusion, before I came on the Senate floor. Again, it says that automobile dealers are excluded from the provisions of Dodd-Frank. Yet the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau found that that it was around direct law and, in that sense, the intent of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives when they passed Dodd-Frank. So just on its face, we ought to decide that the CRA is worth supporting because we are really reaffirming the decision that was made when Dodd-Frank was passed.

Second, the process the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau used—they didn’t draft a rule and go through the rulemaking process and they didn’t put anything out for comment by the industry that would be affected or by the consumers who may pay more as a result of the passage or the enactment of this guidance. But they created something that regulatory bodies often do and tried to provide—the word is “guidance.” What they say they are doing is providing direction, without passing a rule, to those who might be affected by the rule, but as a result of just using guidance, no input was solicited, no data was before could be given, and the Administrative Procedure Act was avoided.

I remember the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was in front of the Banking Committee when he was to testify. How can that be? His answer was simply: This is guidance, and the Administrative Procedure Act doesn’t apply. Yet, as we have seen, the GAO has recently concluded that this is the same outcome, the same result as if the CRA were to be avoided, and therefore subject to the CRA.

What that highlights for me is, in two instances already, the CFPB finagled and created a way to get to an outcome they wanted without following, in this case, the Administrative Procedure Act and, secondly, in violation of the statutory prohibition against having anything to do with automobile dealers. So for those two reasons, I would be opposed to the guidance that was directed to the automobile dealers and those who lend money at the direction of those automobile dealers.

The third point I would raise is what this guidance is designed to do is to prevent discrimination. What they claimed they were doing was to make certain that interest rates do not differ based upon a person’s race. If that were the desired outcome, I would have no qualms. But because you can’t ask a person’s race, there is no way to know. So what the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau did was to create a computer program, an algorithm, in which they guessed what a person’s race was based upon one’s last name, and then based upon their ZIP Code. Never was the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau able to provide the evidence that anyone had been discriminated against, only that if you use an algorithm and run a bunch of numbers through it, the algorithm, based upon what a person’s name sounds like—which I guess, in my mind, is discrimination in and of itself—and, secondly, on their ZIP Code—perhaps the same thing could be said about that—determine what race a person is or was.

So the methods by which the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau determined discrimination were flawed. In fact, a bipartisan report indicated that 41 percent of the determinations were inaccurate, so not quite half of every time the algorithm guessed what the race of a borrower was, it was wrong. Yet that apparently was sufficient for the CFPB to believe they had a basis to determine if someone was discriminated against.

I can’t imagine that many Americans would find it comforting to know that only a computer program determines what somebody believes their race is, again, based upon a hypothetical and not upon actual facts.

Again, the method by which the guidance was used to determine discrimination was significantly flawed and a process in which I can’t believe many Americans would find comfort.

What I would say, finally, is that elimination of the guidance—passage of the CRA today—would not do anything to change the prohibition against discrimination. It is not that if the CRA is adopted that discrimination now becomes legal; in fact, we all can agree that discrimination has no place in our society or in our economy. But the absence of this CFPB guidance does not make discrimination legal. It does nothing to change regulation B, which allows for enforcement of that act.

What we are trying to do is correct the mistakes by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau under Dodd-Frank, which says that you can’t deal with automobile dealers, correct the problems that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau created by using an inappropriate method of determination, and at the same time, not do anything to change the prohibition, the illegality of discriminating against a person based upon that person’s race.

Also, I think we can easily make the case that this kind of guidance, this effort by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, causes damage to the consumer, who therefore will not get the benefit of an appropriate rate of interest because of the fear of this guidance, which then, ultimately, results in just a standard interest rate for everyone.

Today we have the opportunity to correct a problem that was created in contravention of a law that used a flawed method to determine whether a person’s race was based upon one’s last name, and then based upon their ZIP Code. We have the Congressional Review Act to correct a problem that was created in contravention of a law that used a flawed method to determine whether a person’s race was based upon their last name, and then based upon their ZIP Code. Perhaps the same thing could be said about that—determine what race a person is or was.

So the methods by which the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau determined discrimination were flawed. In fact, a bipartisan report indicated that 41 percent of the determinations were inaccurate, so not quite half of every time the algorithm guessed what the race of a borrower was, it was wrong. Yet that apparently was sufficient for the CFPB to believe they had a basis to determine if someone was discriminated against.

I can’t imagine that many Americans would find it comforting to know that only a computer program determines what somebody believes their race is, again, based upon a hypothetical and not upon actual facts.

Again, the method by which the guidance was used to determine discrimination was significantly flawed and a process in which I can’t believe many Americans would find comfort.

What I would say, finally, is that elimination of the guidance—passage of the CRA today—would not do anything to change the prohibition against discrimination. It is not that if the CRA is adopted that discrimination now becomes legal; in fact, we all can agree that discrimination has no place in our society or in our economy. But the absence of this CFPB guidance does not make discrimination legal. It does nothing to change regulation B, which allows for enforcement of that act.
aren't good. At the same time, General Motors in Toledo, because they make the transmissions for the Chevy Cruze in Youngstown, are laying people off. And then the Ohio Turnpike from Toled to Youngstown, this long Ohio turnpike center of the American auto industry—we will probably see layoffs in the supply chain. Even though they got a huge tax cut, written in the office down the hall, in Majority Leader McConnell's office—they got a huge tax cut and lots of money in their pockets. What do they do? They mostly do corporate buybacks and stock buybacks. They share this money with their biggest stockholders.

So what is happening with the tax cut. Now they are giving another handout to a big corporation at the expense of Americans. It is bad enough that we are considering this Congressional Review Act piece of legislation. We are considering a bill that would tell Wall street banks and shady lenders that it is OK to discriminate against borrowers.

Somebody who looks like me can go to a car dealership and get a loan when they are going to buy a Chevy Cruze. My wife and I have each bought a Chevy Cruze. I am going to go finance a Chevy Cruze, and I get a certain interest rate. We have seen data that shows that if somebody looks a little different from me—if they are African American, Latina, Asian American, or Pacific Islanders—they pay a higher interest rate. We know that is what the data says. But this body—from the last vote, it is pretty clear they say that is all right, that if the dealer wants to charge higher interest rates to people of color, that is OK.

So it is bad enough that we are saying today and this body is giving its stamp of approval saying that it is OK to discriminate and to charge higher interest rates to people of color. I have said this in the Banking Committee before, and Senator CRapo has heard me say this before. The ZIP Code is where my wife and I live in Cleveland, OH, had more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States of America. There are reasons for that. Part of the reasons for that is who lives in my ZIP Code, mostly.

But it is not just that which today's legislation would do. It threatens thousands more protections for workers and families that are vulnerable to repeal by Congress.

Republicans have used the Congressional Review Act to repeal important rules that would have given low-wage workers access to retirement plans. So here in the Senate, we talk about caring and we talk about dignity of work, and we talk about helping people save for the future, but one of the provisions of the Congressional Review Act would have given low-wage workers access to retirement plans, and this legislation takes it away.

One of the other rules that were rolled back ensured that Federal contract employers had protections for their workers regardless of race, regardless of gender, regardless of sexual orientation. It ensured that women had the right to choose their own healthcare provider regardless of their former employers decisions. It benefited from it just since its creation

The Congressional Review Act repeals all of those rules.

They repealed the rule that would have guaranteed customers the right to a day in court when they were ripped off by a bank like Wells Fargo. Wells Fargo was never held accountable for ripping off their customers. But we in this body said: Well, you shouldn't have done that, Mr. and Mrs. Wells Fargo, but we are going to let you do that on individual contracts.

So if you are wronged by Wells Fargo or any of these other big financial institutions, you don't get a day in court, sorry. That is what this body did. It is the same with Equifax. We know what happened. Equifax violated the privacy of pretty much half the people in North Dakota or Idaho or Ohio or in this whole country, but we said: That is OK, Equifax; just try not to do it again; and we let them off the hook.

Fortunately, too much time has passed for Congress to follow the Congressional Review Act to roll back other protections the last administration put in place, but they now want to open up a whole new idea. They want to use a legal loophole to interfere with potentially Federal decisions, potentially going back as far as 20 years.

In order to clarify how laws work, Federal agencies—this is really in the weeds, but you know we have some pretty smart people here who figure out how to go in the weeds and find loopholes and exploit people and, frankly, hurt the little guy. Whether she works in construction or punches a time clock or works as a waitress in a diner in Garfield Heights, they find ways to screw the little guy.

So here is how it works. Federal agencies issue guidance to help people understand how the law protects them and to help businesses understand how to follow the law. Just last week, some of these smart people—my Republican colleagues—at a hearing decried the practice of enforcing the law without providing guidance in advance. This week, though—this week—some of those same smart Republicans want to start nullifying agency guidance, which would completely up-end the Federal programs that families depend on. And this is an anti-business decision, too, on their part. The businesses want the predictability, they want the certainty so they can follow the rules.

Under this crazy new plan, some of these very smart Republicans—and at least one of them is on the Banking Committee—under this new plan, they can ban Federal agencies from explaining how States administer Federal healthcare programs, programs like the Children's Health Insurance Program. They can undermine requirements to make sure that federally funded projects pay the local prevailing wages.

Today I went to breakfast with a number of iron workers and glaziers and laborers and electricians and pipe fitters and others who work with their hands and make a damn good living, with good benefits and good retirement for their families. You know what. They can use this newfound rule that these very smart Republican legislators fought out how to exploit to undo decades of good local prevailing wage laws.

Republicans have used the Congressional Review Act to attack access to healthcare and worker and environmental protections. So it is no stretch. They have done it before. It is no stretch that they would do it again, now only there would be no limits on the types of agency actions they can target because they found this loophole and they can go back 20 years. The one vote we are working on this handout to a big corporation at the expense of Americans. It is bad enough that we are saying this many times: The ZIP Code for America. There are reasons for that. Part of the reasons for that is who lives in my ZIP Code, mostly.

It is not just that which today's legislation would do. It threatens thousands more protections for workers and families that are vulnerable to repeal by Congress.

Republicans have used the Congressional Review Act to repeal important rules that would have given low-wage workers access to retirement plans. So here in the Senate, we talk about caring and we talk about dignity of work, and we talk about helping people save for the future, but one of the provisions of the Congressional Review Act would have given low-wage workers access to retirement plans, and this legislation takes it away.

One of the other rules that were rolled back ensured that Federal contract employers had protections for their workers regardless of race, regardless of gender, regardless of sexual orientation. It ensured that women had the right to choose their own healthcare provider regardless of their former employers decisions. It benefited from it just since its creation.

The Congressional Review Act repeals all of those rules.

They repealed the rule that would have guaranteed customers the right to a day in court when they were ripped off by a bank like Wells Fargo. Wells Fargo was never held accountable for ripping off their customers. But we in this body said: Well, you shouldn't have done that, Mr. and Mrs. Wells Fargo, but we are going to let you do that on individual contracts.

So if you are wronged by Wells Fargo or any of these other big financial institutions, you don't get a day in court, sorry. That is what this body did. It is the same with Equifax. We know what happened. Equifax violated the privacy of pretty much half the people in North Dakota or Idaho or Ohio or in this whole country, but we said: That is OK, Equifax; just try not to do it again; and we let them off the hook.

Fortunately, too much time has passed for Congress to follow the Congressional Review Act to roll back other protections the last administration put in place, but they now want to open up a whole new idea. They want to use a legal loophole to interfere with potentially Federal decisions, potentially going back as far as 20 years.

In order to clarify how laws work, Federal agencies—this is really in the weeds, but you know we have some pretty smart people here who figure out how to go in the weeds and find loopholes and exploit people and, frankly, hurt the little guy. Whether she works in construction or punches a time clock or works as a waitress in a diner in Garfield Heights, they find ways to screw the little guy.

So here is how it works. Federal agencies issue guidance to help people understand how the law protects them and to help businesses understand how to follow the law. Just last week, some of these smart people—my Republican colleagues—at a hearing decried the practice of enforcing the law without providing guidance in advance. This week, though—this week—some of those same smart Republicans want to start nullifying agency guidance, which would completely up-end the Federal programs that families depend on. And this is an anti-business decision, too, on their part. The businesses want the predictability, they want the certainty so they can follow the rules.

Under this crazy new plan, some of these very smart Republicans—and at least one of them is on the Banking Committee—under this new plan, they can ban Federal agencies from explaining how States administer Federal healthcare programs, programs like the Children's Health Insurance Program. They can undermine requirements to make sure that federally funded projects pay the local prevailing wages.
tough enforcement actions. It identified discriminatory lending practices in auto loans and home mortgages.

We know discrimination is still a major problem for people of color who make the biggest investment of their lives: their house and their car. Their house and car are the targets of big investments, and you can legally discriminate in this country because of the way somebody looks. You can discriminate against them because of race, and now we are saying it is OK.

Look at what has happened in this country because they said that. Just a few months ago, the Center for Investigative Reporting released a report showing that redlining is still a problem in big American cities to this day. The National Fair Housing Alliance conducted tests and demonstrated that people of color were systematically offered worse loan terms for cars than White borrowers with the exact same credit seeking to purchase the exact same vehicle. But instead of working to root out discrimination in lending, you would think that is what we would all do, Republicans and Democrats alike. Instead, we are making it easier for banks to turn customers away or to take advantage of them based on the color of their skin. This is 2018, for gosh sakes. Why would we still be doing that?

This repeal could permanently weaken Federal anti-discrimination laws. These laws have been the law of the land for decades. These are the laws that brave Americans fought for during the civil rights movement. Do you remember when Congress passed the fair housing bill? The fair housing bill was passed a week after Dr. King’s assassination, 56 years ago last week. You would think we would want to strengthen it, not weaken it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters from the Civil Rights organizations that protect the public on behalf of the American people. We, the undersigned groups, strongly urge Senators to reject abusing the CRA to attack guidance documents that were finalized long ago, and get back to solving real problems on behalf of the American public. We strongly urge you to reject S.J. Resolution 57.


The undersigned organizations are strongly united in opposition to S.J. Resolution 57, sponsored by Sen. Moran (R–KS), which attempts to use the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to nullify agency actions by federal agencies that were issued well in the past and have been in effect for years or potentially even decades. We vigorously oppose any attempt by Congress to strike down precedent established through normal processes—exactly the kind of rigid action on behalf of narrow corporate interests that so infuriates Americans of all political stripes.

This Congress has already used the CRA in unprecedented fashion to repeal fourteen common-sense, carefully developed regulations that protect the public, including measures to protect internet privacy, women’s health, retirement security, workplace safety, fair pay in the workplace, the environment and clean water, anti-corruption safeguards, and sensible gun control. Unlike the normal legislative process, the CRA is already problematic legislation which gives Congress the power to undo regulations that protect the public on behalf of narrow special interests without any congressional hearings and virtually no floor debate. The approach would be for Congress to revisit this flawed process rather than expand it to undermine policies that were finalized long ago.

Applying the CRA to settled agency actions from the past would violate the clear intent and spirit of the law. The legislative history of the CRA makes plain its purpose: “this legislation establishes a government wide congressional review mechanism for most new rules.” As a procedural matter, Congress should have, reviewed the guidance at issue here back in 2013 when it was issued by the CFPB, requested a GAO opinion at that time to determine its eligibility under the CRA and potentially used the CRA to challenge such guidance shortly after its issuance in 2013. Indeed, Congress has made multiple GAO requests regarding the applicability of the CRA to guidance documents when the guidance was originally issued or shortly thereafter. Subjecting these actions to the CRA now would be of congres- sional intent and stretch the law in ways that were neither anticipated nor expected by those who voted for it.

Moreover, we are suspicious that this CRA challenge is being undertaken now, rather than following the issuance of the guidance in 2013, because there is a higher chance of success given the makeup of this Congress.

Moreover, applying the CRA to long-established guidance would be wrong-headed. Guidance documents are often specifically requested by regulated entities and industry stakeholders in order to resolve uncertainty or provide valua- tion of regulations to industry businesses, including in the form of so-called “No Action Letters”. Using the CRA to nullify guidance documents would imperil numerous past guidance docu- ments that were not submitted to Congress under the CRA, including many that were specifically requested by regulated entities or industry stakeholders. Congress should act with caution, if at all, in using the CRA on guidance documents, but applying the CRA to longstanding guidance would be misguided.

Moreover, applying the CRA to longstanding guidance would be misguided.

Given the long and growing list of legisla- tive issues that need to be addressed by the Senate, it is difficult to fathom why the Senate would choose to spend valuable floor time to repeal guidance under the CRA when such guidance serves to effectively narrow certain agencies’ discretion and if appro- priate, repealed by the agency that issued it in short order and with limited procedural requirements. By bringing this vote to the floor, it sends a message to the public that Congress is more interested in giving narrow handouts to special interests rather than addressing the real issues that impact hard-working Americans and their families.

We, the undersigned groups, strongly urge Senators to reject abusing the CRA to attack guidance documents that were finalized long ago, and get back to solving real problems on behalf of the American public. We strongly urge you to reject S.J. Resolution 57.
organizations, ask you to oppose S.J. Res. 57, the Congressional Review Act (CRA), introduced by Senator Jerry Moran (R-KS), intended to undo the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s (CFPB or Consumer Bureau) Indirect Auto Lending Guidance, published over five years ago. This resolution is the latest in a series of attempts to chill federal enforcement of anti-discrimination. Discrimination in the auto lending market is well-documented and results in people of color paying more for years to finance a car purchase. This CRA would also set the dangerous precedent of undoing long-standing federal agency guidance—an expansion of the Congressional Review Act, and certainly beyond its original purpose of narrowly reviewing regulations soon after they were enacted.

The November 2013 indirect auto lending guidance put auto lenders on notice that the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (ECOA) makes them liable for discriminatory pricing on auto loans they acquire from auto dealers. ECOA makes it illegal for a creditor to discriminate in any aspect of a credit transaction on the basis of race or other protected class. Indirect auto lenders are creditors under ECOA.

Discrimination in auto lending has long been a significant issue. The discriminatory dealer mark-up, three-fourths of all consumers use a loan to purchase a car, and 80% of auto loans are financed by auto dealers. The dealer usually collects basic information regarding the applicant and uses an automated system to forward that information to several prospective indirect auto lenders. Indirect auto lenders can offer the lowest interest rate and keep some or all of the difference. These mark-ups have been found to add over $25 billion to the total loan cost of auto loans made over the course of one year.

The discriminatory impact of this discriminatory practice has been researched and documented, time and again. In the mid-1990s, a series of lawsuits were filed against the largest auto finance companies based on data showing that that borrowers of color were twice as likely to have their loans marked up and paid markups twice as large as similarly situated white borrowers with similar credit profiles. The CFPB’s own investigations found that borrowers who identified as African American, Latino, and Asian Pacific Islander paid between 20 and 36 basis points more for their loans than similarly situated white borrowers, adding between $150 and $300 in additional interest over the life of those consumers’ loans.

The evidence that enforcement against auto lending discrimination has resulted in real benefits to wronged borrowers has been widespread, and a significant culprit is borrowers of color.

For the millions who lost their jobs, for the millions who lost their homes in the financial crisis a decade ago, for the millions who are struggling to build their retirement with wages that haven’t been growing for more than 20 years, it is already hard enough to get ahead. We should be making it easier for them, not harder.

I ask for a “no” vote.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the bill call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE, Mr. President, today is tax day, not typically a day of celebration for anyone—but maybe the exception for the IRS. But we are here—believe it or not—something to celebrate because tax day 2018 marks the end of the old tax system.

Next year, Americans will be filling out their taxes under the new tax system that was enacted by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. That means that they will be paying less in taxes and keeping more of their hard-earned money.
If anything became clear during the last election cycle, it was that the economy was not working well for American families. In CNN exit polling, 62 percent of voters rated the economy as poor, and that wasn’t surprising. We were in the middle of a 10-year recovery for American workers. Job creation was sluggish, wages were stagnant, and economic growth lagged far behind the pace of other recoveries. Opportunities for workers were few and far between. One reason I wonder that so many hard-working Americans felt like they had been left behind.

Republicans were listening, and one of our top priorities in this Congress has been improving the economic outlook for the American people, which is why last fall we took up tax reform.

The Tax Code may not be the first thing people think of when they think of economic prosperity, but it actually plays a key role in determining the success of families and the health of our economy as a whole. The more money the Federal Government takes from you in taxes, the less money you have to pay bills or to buy a house or repair your car or save for retirement. The more money a business has to give to the Federal Government, the less money it has to grow the business and to invest in its workers.

So when it came time to draft a tax bill, Republicans had two goals. First, we wanted to put more money in the pockets of hard-working Americans right away. Second, we wanted to create the kind of economy that would give Americans access to economic security for the future.

Now, I am proud to report that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has already achieved the first goal and is well on its way to achieving the second. To put more money in Americans’ pockets, we lowered tax rates across the board and nearly doubled the standard deduction—the amount of Americans’ income that is automatically free from taxation.

We also acted to provide relief for parents, who are doing the hard work of raising the next generation, by doubling the child tax credit and allowing more parents to claim the credit. We eliminated the individual mandate tax, which disproportionately hit low-income families. We also made sure to protect key retirement savings plans—401(k)s and other retirement accounts—and we improved education savings accounts, allowing families to use them to save for elementary and secondary as well as higher education.

Thanks to the IRS’s new withholding tables and its new withholding calculator, Americans have already started seeing the new tax relief in their paychecks.

For a lot of Americans, that is not all they are seeing in their paychecks. A lot of Americans are also seeing pay increases or bonuses thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

That brings me to our second reform goal, which was creating the kind of economy that would give Americans access to economic security and prosperity for the long term. We knew that the only way to give Americans access to real long-term economic security was to ensure that they had access to good jobs, good wages, and real opportunities. That is why we only way to guarantee access to good jobs, wages, and opportunities was to make sure that businesses had the ability to create and maintain them.

But before the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, our Tax Code was helping businesses to create jobs or to increase opportunities for workers. In fact, it was doing the opposite, and that had real consequences for American workers.

A small business owner struggling to afford the hefty annual tax bill for her business was highly unlikely to be able to hire a new worker or to raise wages. A larger business struggling to stay competitive in the global marketplace while paying a substantially higher tax rate than its foreign competitors too often had limited funds to expand or increase investment here in the United States.

So when it came time for tax reform, we set out to improve the playing field for American workers by lowering the playing field for businesses as well. To accomplish that, we lowered tax rates across the board for owners of small and medium-sized businesses and farms and ranches. We lowered our Nation’s statutory corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 21 percent, the lowest it has been in 50 years, and we capped the corporate tax rate at 9 percent for pass-through businesses. The more money Americans have to work with, the more skilled workers our employers can hire and the more employees our employers can raise wages and benefits for.

We brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century by replacing our outdated worldwide system with a modernized territorial tax system. The result is a level playing field for businesses as well. To support U.S. businesses, we lowered the tax rates that businesses pay on earnings kept overseas to 11.5 percent, the lowest rate in the world.

We also lowered the tax rates of American businesses that are not operating at a disadvantage relative to their foreign competitors. The goal in all of this was to free up businesses to increase investments in the U.S. economy, to hire new workers, and to increase wages and benefits, and that is exactly what they are doing.

In response to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, more than 500 companies across this country, and counting, have announced good news for American workers. Company after company has announced pay raises, bonuses, 401(k) match increases, and other benefits. Others are expanding their businesses and investing in new equipment and facilities. Still others are passing tax savings on to their customers in the form of things like utility rate cuts. That means more money for Americans now and more money for Americans in the future.

Tax day may never be a fun day, but American Tax Code can take heart because thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, next year’s tax day is going to be a lot less painful. I yield the floor.
Let me explain a little bit about what this is. Indirect auto lending—what is that? Direct auto lending is what you might think. It is when a consumer, a buyer—someone who wants to buy a car—goes to a bank and lines up financing from the bank. That would be direct auto financing. Indirect auto financing is when the car dealer provides the arrangement of the financing for you. The actual financing is ultimately performed by a lending institution, but the car dealer makes the arrangement.

Indirect auto loans are actually very good for consumers for a variety of reasons. No. 1, it is very convenient. You don’t have to shop around to a bunch of banks, as well as a bunch of car dealers. You get one-stop shopping, and you have both.

No. 2, it tends to be more competition for the consumers’ loan. How many banks are you going to realistically go out and visit when you are attempting to shop your financing? But the car dealer can routinely canvass all the available lending options and make sure the consumer gets the best possible deal.

Finally, as a routine matter of practice, dealers have always been able to discount the loan as one of the negotiating provisions in a multipart transaction. That is important to stress here. The nature of the car-buying experience—for any of us who have done it—we shop for the car, moving parts, several transactions. There is the purchase price you negotiate for the vehicle you are buying and the trade-in value for the vehicle you are parting with. There is the value of other services you may negotiate for. It is not possible to judge the overall economics of a transaction like this unless you know all of the components. The interest rate you pay on the loan is but one of several important elements. The interest rate you pay on the loan is one of the most important, they willfully chose to ignore all the other components of the transaction. They tried to guess their race based on the last name and geography. They assign a probability to a person being African American or Hispanic or European American or whatever based on a surname and geography. This is a wildly flawed process, which quite predictably led to huge errors.

Let me explain briefly what this means. First of all, if lending policy is discriminatory, it is illegal. If there is discrimination on the basis of any protected class—and that would include race, sex, age, gender, and other things that are protected—What the CFPB found came along and said is, even if the lending policy is not discriminatory—not on its face, it is nondiscriminatory—you can still be liable for the violation of the law if the CFPB thinks there is a protected class, some category of people, who are paying, on average, a higher interest rate on their loan. This is the disparate impact theory the CFPB used in order to attempt to end the ability of auto dealers to discount loans as part of a negotiated transaction for the purchase of a vehicle.

Why is this so problematic? There are two categories. First is the very process by which the CFPB came up with this rule. First of all, it is actually a guidance, not a rulemaking. What does that mean? That means they chose not to follow the law, the Administrative Procedure Act, that requires an agency go through a very systematic and public process of getting a proposed law, proposed rule, before it goes into effect.

For very good reason, we require regulators to get public input, to give experts, consumers, and people engaged in the business the opportunity to examine the rule under consideration and provide some feedback as to whether there might be unforeseen consequences or flaws in it. They did none of this. The CFPB did not consult with the other regulators, as they are required by Dodd-Frank, nor did they do a cost-benefit analysis, which is also required by Dodd-Frank. They surprised the industry and the consumers by fundamentally reinterpreting how the anti-discrimination legislation would be interpreted.

Why did they do this? Why did they take this approach? Why did they circumvent the Administrative Procedure Act? It is a convenient way to avoid scrutiny. In a few words, they imposed a one’s will upon the consumers without public scrutiny, without any analysis.

This is a very bad process and, not surprisingly, the outcome is equally bad. The methodology they used to determine the basis of race is really amazing. Since there is no information about the race of a borrower in financing for a vehicle, the lenders don’t know the race of the borrowers, literally. They have no idea. Neither does the CFPB, but that didn’t stop them from alleging racial discrimination. They developed a methodology, a system, where they attempt to guess the race of a car buyer who is financing the purchase of a car through a loan and assign their race based on the last name and geography. They assign a probability to a person being African American or Hispanic or European American or whatever based on a surname and geography.

This is a wildly flawed process, which quite predictably led to huge errors. Independent, outside analysis has concluded that their error rates could be as high as 40 percent. So 40 percent of the people they would designate as African American, or 40 percent of the people they would designate as European American, in fact, are not. It is not just that they got their guesstimate wrong about race, but the manner in which they got it wrong led to the wrong and erroneous conclusion. In other words, there were systemic flaws that completely invalidated their conclusions.

Finally, and maybe in some ways most important, they willfully chose to ignore all the other components of the transaction. They alleged that someone was adversely impacted because they paid a higher rate of interest on a loan, but they have no idea what the purchase price on the vehicle was. They have no idea what the trade-in was for the used vehicle. They have no idea what other services were being offered.

This gets worse. The CFPB decided they needed to make an example of some consumer, so they came to the industry into ending this practice of discounting interest rates, and they found a good victim. The Federal Government owned about 74 percent of Ally Bank at the time. They had a settlement before the Fed to change their corporate organization, which they needed to do. They needed to complete that; otherwise, they would have to shed whole business lines. It is a long, complicated story. Suffice it to say, Ally Bank’s future existence, as it was formed, depended on an approval from the Fed for what should have been a routine change in corporate structure. The Fed made it clear they weren’t going to do that unless there was a settlement with the CFPB, so Ally Bank was over a barrel. That was exactly what the CFPB wanted. Five days before the deadline, which would have required Ally Bank to divest itself of some whole categories of business, the CFPB shook them down for $100 million. Four days later, the Fed approves the application. The CFPB found its opportunity, made its example, and it had a chilling effect on the market.

Let me wrap this up. What are we talking about here. It is an unaccountable, out-of-control agency that circumvented the proper rulemaking process in order to avoid public scrutiny, about what they were going to do. They imposed their will on an industry that the Dodd-Frank legislation explicitly forbid them from regulating. They developed a badly flawed methodology to allege discrimination on the part of lenders on the basis of race, despite the fact that the lenders didn’t know the race of the borrowers. They picked a victim who couldn’t fight back. They hit the victim with a $100 million fine without the CFPB knowing. They picked any individual was actually unfairly treated by Ally Bank. It didn’t matter.

Who ultimately pays the price for this kind of behavior? The very consumers the CFPB is supposed to be serving. Under this very flawed rule of the CFPB, the goal was to effectively prevent auto dealers from being able to discount the interest rate on a loan, being unable to compete with a bank down the road that might be offering a lower rate, being unable to negotiate a term that might be helpful to a borrower.

Consumers under the CFPB’s rule have fewer options, less flexibility, required to credit and higher costs. That is why Congress should overturn this. This is our opportunity to set this right. The House voted 332 to 96 to repeal this rule. We can do this tomorrow.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have complained about the use of a CRA in application to a guidance issue. Our Democratic colleagues
themselves attempted to do this exact same thing with respect to a chip guidance that was issued some years ago, and they were perfectly OK with it then. I don’t see why they can’t be OK with it now.

It is important to note what this resolution does not do. It does not change, in any way, the legitimate enforcement of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. It doesn’t amend that act. It doesn’t change regulation B. The enforcement of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act would simply continue as it had gone for 30-plus years. Discrimination in credit providing has been illegal and will continue to be illegal when we successfully pass this CRA.

I thank Senator Moran and Will Ruder from his staff, John Crews from my staff. I thank Terry van Doren from Leader McCon nell’s staff for his help. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important Congressional Review Act resolution. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

TAX REFORM

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, today is tax day. On the days leading up to April 15 actually, but nonetheless, today is tax day. I rise to speak about the impact of what we have done over the last 15 months to affect the future of our free enterprise system in America. When President Donald Trump took office last year, he set out with three clear priorities. Under the major objective last year, job one was to grow the economy. To do that, he charged us in Congress to focus on three things: regulations, energy, and taxes. In addition to those three, we were supposed to try to get to Dodd-Frank and take away some of the onerous mandates, and adjustments to the Clean Power Plan and the waters of the Clean Water Act. That would simply continue as it had gone for 17 years. As an ex-retailer and a person who has worked with consumer products and in manufacturing for most of his career, I have not witnessed a governmental event the past to be at a 17-year high this early in this turnaround. It bodes well for the future of what we have just done.

CEO confidence is at a 20-year high. Some $2 trillion in overseas profits has been potentially unlocked to be made available now for capital investment back in this country. Yes, we already see public corporations making public statements in their quarterly earnings reviews about the capital investment plans they are laying out. We see investment increases being announced every month from public companies in America today. There is no question that businesses are beginning to bring those profits home and investing in our economy.

Nationally, in addition, over 4 million Americans have received bonuses and wage increases. Over 500 businesses have taken positive action, be it by giving out bonuses, raising wages, increasing 401(k) matches, or increasing their overall investments in their companies.

As a matter of fact, another benefit is that most of these public corporations have major foundations that do intense and potentially tremendously constructive philanthropic work. Most of these companies that have made these announcements about their own financial well-being and those of their employees have also dramatically increased their contributions to those philanthropic efforts and those trust funds.

In my home State of Georgia, dozens of companies are taking action because of these changes to the Tax Code, and they are making these statements public. Just go to any public corporation today that is in its latest quarterly return and look at what it is saying about how this tax change affects its business and the future of its employees.

It is huge for the entire country because we are much more competitive today than we have been. For years the Tax Code was working against American workers and our economy. It was crippling small businesses’ ability to expand their companies and hire more workers. It was damaging our ability to compete with the rest of the world. Changing the Tax Code last year was the single greatest thing we could have done to have unleashed economic growth this year, and we are just getting started.

I have been through some of these large turnarounds, and I characterize this as a mega turnaround. After 8 years of the lowest economic growth in U.S. history, we are now on the rebound. That is so important for the future of our country in the long term. We have a $21 trillion debt today, as the Presiding Officer knows. One of the ways that we are working our way out of that is to get our economy healthy again. As documented by the CBO, or the Congressional Budget Office, a 1-percent growth in GDP will yield $300 billion of Federal revenue over the next year. That is how we are going to pay off this debt over the next decade. With the projection that we are going to add $10 trillion to the debt over the next decade just from decisions that have been made over the last decade, we can see that just growing the economy alone is not enough to solve this debt crisis.

There are some in this body who have argued that this has been nothing but a boondoggle, nothing but a huge deficit-increasing exercise. Yes, there were identified costs included with this, but what was not considered by the CBO was the long-term return on investment, the leverage effect of that return on investment, or the leverage effect of this returning profit situation that we are coming back from. Yes, we have come back from what was not considered by the CBO in the repatriation law. In addition to that, the CBO disagreed with using the impact of foreign direct investment, which I really don’t understand.

I am proud that we got this tax bill done, and I know that the positive impact is really just beginning. There are other things we must do to deal with our national debt in the long term, like fixing our budget process, cutting back on redundant agencies, saving Social Security and Medicare, and finally getting after the spiral of the underlying drivers of our healthcare costs and not just the insurance of it.

This wouldn’t be happening without these changes to the Tax Code, however, and without a President with a new perspective in the White House. President Trump worked in the real world for decades, and he brings that sense of urgency to the White House. Today he is working at a business pace, not at a bureaucratic pace, and he is committed to keeping up the positive momentum.

This year, the pressure is on the other side because, right now, as we are
trying to deal with immigration, the labor issue might be a constraining factor in the ultimate growth of this economy, and we need to deal with that. For different reasons, both sides believe we need to be investing in infrastructure. I support my colleagues in this body that it was a bad move in 2011 when this government threw $1 trillion into our economy. I would debate the benefit of that particular investment because it was not thrown at those stimulative issues that would grow the economy.

Today, America deals with a new world. The world situation has never been more dangerous. The best thing we can do for our military and for our people is to get this economy moving again and create a level playing field around the world to help our trade situation. That is what the President is trying to do right now—to create a more level playing field so as to grow our economy, fix our budget process, and deal with the spending issues that we have here at home.

I am excited to be a part of the Joint Select Committee on Budget Process Reform, which is charged with changing the way we fund the Federal Government every year. I am hopeful that will lead to a new budget process that will allow us to avoid the continuing resolutions and the omnibus by which five or six people get in a room and decide how to spend $1 trillion. The tax changes alone will not dig us out of this debt crisis. We knew that this was the first step in getting it going, and I am delighted with the impact that it is having on our economy today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 5:30 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:21 p.m., recessed until 5:33 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ROBERTS).

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I am here to give some brief remarks about what we are on right now, which is a Congressional Review Act vehicle to reconsider agency guidance. There is nothing that sounds more arcane and wonky than that.

The issue at hand has to do with disparate treatment of people when they go in to get a car. There is plenty of evidence that Black and Brown people are taken advantage of and treated more poorly in the credit context than White people. So the CFPB went to court in Texas to require that people be treated fairly.

I will be voting against this CRA vehicle, but I actually think there is a bigger, broader, more concerning issue. I am going to try to work with the Parliamentarian and the leadership of both parties to try to address it. Although it is arcane, it is very worrisome for the Senate itself.

The Congressional Review Act passed in 1996. The idea was straightforward: All rules have to have some authority beyond the desire for the agency to want to promulgate rules. It is subject to review by the Congress. In other words, if you don’t like what an agency is doing, now there is a pathway called the CRA—Congress has to go ahead and overturn that rule. In the Senate, it is especially important because it is not subject to a 60-vote threshold. This is a big deal. This allows Congress to say any time there is a rule that is going to overturn it with a bare majority threshold. That was the will of the Congress, and that is Federal law.

Here is how the statute works. The rule gets submitted to GAO and Congress, and then a clock starts and a bunch of statutory triggers go. I dug into this over the last 10 weeks. Suffice it to say it is very complicated. There is a strict timeline, and there are 60 legislative days to take action. And because we are the legislative branch of the Federal Government, legislative days are not actual days; it ends up taking four times that long.

The important part is that there is a process that is prescribed for that, and there is a timeframe prescribed for that. That is the authority the Congress gave itself in 1996. That authority is very clear about two things:

First, it is meant to apply to rules, which are binding, and it is meant to have legal force. The CRA gives the Congress a way to weigh in when an agency’s interpretation of the law conflicts with the legislative intentions.

Second, it only applies to rules that were recently promulgated. In other words, those are rules that are envisioned that a clock would run. The rule gets submitted to Congress, the clock runs, and if the Congress likes the rule or if there is not sufficient will to overturn the rule, then the rule stands. If the Congress doesn’t like the rule, then a Member can introduce a CRA resolution of disapproval, and we act on it.

This is why what is happening right now is totally nuts. What is happening right now is not what we have normally done with CRAs. What is happening right now is not what we have normally done with agency guidance—not a rule but agency guidance—which has no legal force, to the same procedures as the rules under the Congressional Review Act. The guidance in question is implementing guidance for a statute that is 50 years old. The guidance came out 5 years ago. The law that it is implementing is 50 years old. It is a piece of guidance. It is literally interpretation of an existing law. And now we are going to overturn the interpretation of an existing law from an executive agency. We are not overturning a rulemaking.

When you go through the rulemaking process in the executive branch, it takes anywhere from 12 to 36 months. There is a rigorous process. It is sort of quasi-judicial, and you have to really check all the boxes and do it right. Otherwise, you get sued under the Administrative Procedure Act. None of that happened. This was just guidance.

So now, if the Parliamentarian and the GAO and everyone else decides that the CRA applies to guidance, then the time limits on CRA don’t matter at all. We can take some lazy interpretation of this statute is rendered absurd.

I will point out that this is not the most well-crafted Federal law on the books. It is very difficult to interpret this federal law, so I sympathize with the Parliamentarian and GAO and the leadership of both parties, who are trying to make sense of a statute that is unclear in some places. But when a statute is unclear, you are supposed to interpret the statute in a way that achieves the purpose of what we are doing is we are rendering the statute essentially absurd because if it is a rule, you have a strict time limit. If it is guidance—and I am not sure, if it is guidance, why that wouldn’t also apply to an agency circular or an executive memorandum for the Under Secretary. All of this could be subject to tens of thousands of pieces of guidance and rules and views, and whatever is considered policymaking could be subject to the Congressional Review Act action. I think that is completely bananas.

We are going down a path where Congress can take an administrative action that has been done in the last 22 years and subject it to the CRA, and you will not need 60 votes. This is bad for our institution. I can’t stress that enough. I understand that this is not the kind of thing that people across the country are going to be deeply passionate about and riding the streets about and be motivated to vote on, but we are in the Senate, and we have an obligation to safeguard the way this institution operates.

I am deeply afraid that if we subject every piece of administrative guidance—and remember, the door swings both ways in Washington. We will have a Democratic Senate. Who knows when, but we will have a Democratic Senate and we will have a Democratic House and we can scour everything that the current Republican administration has done since 1996 pursuant to any law made at any time in our American history and subject it to a majority vote.
I think the last thing this institution needs is a new opportunity to go down new rabbit holes on partisan issues and a new opportunity to fight on small things and not deal with the biggest challenges of our time.

I agree with this on the merits, but I am more worried about what we are doing to our institution. Right now, the Senate is not functioning at a high level. We have not had any open amendment process except vote-a-rama, which the majority leaders would say is a useless process. So the regular order, which was called for by the then-minority leader when he was criticizing Majority Leader Reid, is nowhere to be found. I am not blaming him. I am not blaming anyone in particular. But I am saying that when there is an opportunity to at least prevent this institution from falling further, we should take that opportunity.

I understand we are not going to be able to intervene in this moment and stop this, but let the record reflect that I do not accept that a precedent is being set. This has not been referred yet. We have not fully had a conversation with the Parliamentary and GAO about what exactly CRA is supposed to be a member and how it can be posed to operate. If it is supposed to operate in an absurd way, I think we have a lot of work to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

TAX REFORM

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, first of all, happy tax day—three words that probably don’t usually go together. I will share that anyway because the reason I am up here is that for the first time in more than three decades, Congress overhauled our Tax Code, and that is what distinguishes this tax day from the ones that came before it. This is the last time Nevadans will file their taxes under the broken system of the past.

You don’t have to look too far to see the positive impacts of our new tax laws. They are already having an impact on the people of my home State of Nevada. Nevadans and Americans throughout the country have already benefited from keeping more of their hard-earned money. In fact, more than 1 million Nevadans saw their paycheck get bigger last month because we doubled the standard deduction and we doubled the child tax credit. Taxpayers in every income category received a tax cut under this bill.

Furthermore, since President Trump signed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act into law just a few months ago, more than 500 companies throughout the country have committed to giving their workers bonuses, pay raises, and enhanced benefits as a direct result of tax reform. Let me share a few of those in my home State. About 11,000 Nevadans got a raise, more than 13,000 Nevadans received special bonuses of up to $2,000. Up to 25,000 Nevadans may benefit from college tuition assistance, increased pension funding, expanded maternity and paternal leave, and more paid holidays. More than 10,000 jobs are expected to be created in Southern Nevada alone.

So it is no surprise that Nevada was ranked number one among States when it comes to small business income families who benefit the most from tax reform.

Let me give you a few examples of how this new law is impacting Nevadans. South Point Hotel Casino and Spa doubled bonuses for its 2,300 full-time workers. The Prospector Hotel in Elly gave its employees a $500 bonus and raised its starting wages. Mcdonald’s, which has around 9,000 employees in my State, is expanding its education benefits program, tripling the amount of money eligible workers can receive to help cover the cost of college tuition.

Lowe’s Home Improvement, which employs more than 2,000 Nevadans, announced it is expanding benefits, such as adoption assistance and parental paid leave, and giving bonuses of up to $1,000 to its employees.

Walmart announced it will increase wages, give eligible employees a special bonus of $1,000, and expand maternity and parental leave benefits—benefiting up to 8,700 Walmart associates who are living in the great State of Nevada.

CVS, which has roughly 2,000 employees and 10 pharmacies in Nevada, announced that effective this month, it will increase the starting salary and wages for hourly employees.

Developers of the stalled Fontainebleau Resort, recently renamed the Drew, announced they will resume the project and have committed to creating over 10,000 new jobs.

A–1 Steel, which is based in Sparks, NV, implemented eight paid holidays for its employees.

Finally, Cox Communications said it will give around 1,750 Nevadans bonuses of up to $2,000 today. Yes, on tax day they will be giving their employees bonuses of up to $2,000. This is just the beginning.

During a phone call from the National Federation of Independent Business in Nevada, roughly 9 in 10 Nevada business owners said that because of the new tax law, they plan to take action that includes increasing workers’ wages and benefits to their companies. Several companies are also pledging to put more of their capital back into our country rather than overseas.

Apple, which recently broke ground on a new facility in Reno, announced it will create 20,000 new jobs nationally, open a new campus, and directly contribute $350 billion to the U.S. economy over the next 5 years.

Make no mistake about it, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is working for the people in Nevada. Despite the bill’s critics, who have described these tax cuts as “crumbs” and said it is “the worst bill in the history of the U.S. Congress,” this new bill couldn’t have come at a better time. Let me tell you again why.

Under the failed economic policies of the Obama administration, Nevadans suffered through 8 years of historically low economic growth. Think about this. In those years, the average economic growth was less than 2 percent. As a result, wages and workers suffered, job creation suffered, and the middle class in America suffered.

It has been reported that nearly 8 in 10 Americans who work full time are living paycheck to paycheck. If you live in Nevada, you are more likely to be living paycheck to paycheck than if you lived anywhere else.

Whether it is a single mother, who is taking classes to further her education to give her kids a good life, or the police officer and teacher with four children in Southern Nevada who tell me that they are barely getting by and are doing the best they can, families in my State are trying to plan for their future, while they are struggling, but it is not just Nevadans who felt the squeeze.

Nearly two-thirds of Americans don’t even have $500 set aside to cover an unexpected emergency expense. That is why earlier this year, the Senate passed a provision in the new law that doubles the child tax credit to $2,000 per child. Think about this. The enhanced child tax credit could mean enough money for a family of 4 to cover more than 6 months’ worth of groceries, buy school supplies for 4 kids, and purchase more than 9,000 diapers. It will allow families to better plan for their futures.

Take Sarah as an example, a single mom living in Nevada. She told us she used her child tax credit to help her and her four children move out of a family shelter and pay rent a full year in advance.

In addition to doubling the child tax credit, we doubled the standard deduction, cut rates for low-income and middle-class families. It is expected that a typical family of four will keep more than $2,000 this year.

It also lowered rates on businesses to ensure that we are globally competitive and help ignite economic growth. I am pleased this bill included my provision to make it easier for startups to give more junior employees an ownership stake in their company’s success.

I have been fighting for tax reform for years, and last year we set out to cut taxes for hard-working Americans and agreed to a framework that included three main goals: create more jobs, increase wages, and boost American competitiveness. Even though it has only been a few months, I believe we have already achieved all three of those.

As the son of an auto mechanic and a school cook, I grew up watching my
When I go around Ohio, I talk to people, and they say: You know, Rob, my paycheck has already changed. That is because 90 percent of Americans are now being told they will have less withholding taken out of their paycheck. That affects the bottom line for all businesses, big and small. We are hearing more and more that because we have seen a lot of headlines. There was another one today about yet another major company that is making some investments in this country.

I was at the Kroger company yesterday. Kroger is one of the largest employers in the United States. It is a great grocery store chain—the largest in the country, by the way. They happen to be headquartered in Ohio. They made a huge announcement yesterday. They said they are going to take the savings they got from the tax relief and tax reform measure, and they are going to substantially give it back to their employees.

The things they talked about were very interesting. One is to increase the health care contributions they might already give a 100-percent match. Now they are going to do it at 5 percent, rather than 4 percent, of people’s salary. That is nice because people can save more for their own retirement.

They also talked about providing employee assistance programs. They are increasing funding for that program. They talked about the employee discount program so the employees can buy things at a discount. They are expanding more things they can buy and how much they can buy with discounts. That helps their employees.

They also talked about something I thought was really wonderful, which is continuing education—lifelong learning. They said they are going to provide their employees with a $3,500-a-year—$3,500-a-year stipend to continue their education. Maybe it is getting a GED, or maybe it is getting an MBA and everything in between, but they believe in education. They want to help these employees be able to better themselves. They believe that will also help them to keep people longer term. This is part of how they are using the tax cut.

By the way, it is applicable to everybody who has been there for 6 months. You only have to be there for 6 months to apply for this. You can be there part time or full time, and you get this assistance for education. This is all coming from the tax relief this body passed.

Is it making a difference in the lives of our constituents? It certainly is in the lives of my mine; I can tell you that.

I have now been to 13 different businesses around the State of Ohio, and I have asked them this question directly: What is happening? What are you doing? All of them tell me they are investing either in their people or they are investing in their plants and equipment, helping the technology so people can do their jobs more and more effectively, and more effective at doing their jobs.

I have also had a half dozen roundtable discussions, where I bring small business owners together, and dozens of businesses have told me what they are doing. Some of them are providing more healthcare coverage. In a couple of cases—one is a small craft brewer in Ohio, another is an auto parts company—they are providing healthcare for their employees for the first time.

In one case, they had it before it got too expensive because of the Affordable Care Act, and now they are able to provide healthcare for their employees.
Another one had never provided healthcare because it was a small business just getting started, and now they can provide healthcare for their employees because of the savings from the tax bill. Others are doing much more in terms of the community and charitable giving, again, some with regard to 401(k)s and some with regard to new equipment and machines to make their employees more productive.

When we look at last month and the month before, we can see these wages start creeping back up again. This is really exciting to me because, ultimately, we want to see economic growth, yes, but we really want to see working families be able to see a little higher paycheck, that they are not stuck in this squeeze where their income is flat and yet their expenses are up.

What is the biggest expense that has been increasing? Healthcare. So, yes, we have the 80 percent and, yes, we have to do more to increase economic growth, but wouldn't it be great to have wages going up to be able to compensate for that and to give people again the sense that if they are doing the right things in life, if they are willing to work hard and play by the rules, they can get ahead and their kids and their grandkids can get ahead too.

So I am excited to be here today to say that this is the last day we have to file an amendment, but also to say that the new Tax Code is helping to give the families that I represent the opportunity to do a little better, to give businesses that I represent the opportunity to be more competitive and to reinvest in their companies, and to reinvest in their employees and their competitiveness and their productivity. That, ultimately, is what is going to make the biggest difference in this tax reform effort.

With that, I see that one of my colleagues is here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, this is a very focused topic and I will just be a few minutes.

I rise today to discuss S. Res. 463, which is a resolution that Senator BLUNT and I just discharged from the Rules Committee. I recognize that this means the most fundamental among them being voting on legislation. The Senate rules require Senators to vote in person. We have no intention of changing that. They must vote on the Senate floor, and no one can do it for them.

Right now, unlike in the House, children are not allowed on the Senate floor. That means that in order to fulfill her Senate obligation, Senator DUCKWORTH would have to leave her baby for extended periods in order to come in and vote. Sometimes that would be just fine. She would have childcare. Her husband would be there. But as we all know, there are times when we vote late into the night, when we vote at unpredictable times, and it doesn't work for a mom with a newborn.

So what did Senator DUCKWORTH do? She called for legislation to change the rules so that Senators can bring their infants on the floor during votes, and we worked to come up with a workable proposal.

I am proud to say that this week, the Senate Rules Committee swiftly discharged the legislation so that it can be passed by the full Senate, because that is what working moms do. They stick together and they get the job done.

Sticking together means recognizing that we have a lot of work to do inside the Halls of Congress. The truth is too many American moms aren’t in positions of power to change the rules, which is why it is so important for those of us who are in positions of power to be champions of change, not just here in the Senate but in workplaces across the country. It is wrong that America is the only industrialized country without a law that requires paid maternity leave, and it is wrong that only 10 percent of American employers offer workers full pay during parental leave.
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
At 2:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment: S. 167. An act to designate a National Memorial to Fallen Educators at the National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia, Kansas.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:
H.R. 146. An act to take certain Federal lands in Tennessee for the benefit of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes.
H.R. 443. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish fees for medical services provided in units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.
H.R. 3607. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish fees for medical services provided in units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.
H.R. 3601. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Kissimmee River and its tributaries in the State of Florida for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.
H.R. 4699. An act to provide for the conveyance of a Forest Service site in Dolores County, Colorado, to be used for a fire station.

MEASURES REFERRED
The following bills were read the first time, and referred to the Senate committees.
H.R. 146. An act to take certain Federal lands in Tennessee into trust for the benefit of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
H.R. 3607. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish fees for medical services provided in units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.
H.R. 3601. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Kissimmee River and its tributaries in the State of Florida for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.
H.R. 4699. An act to provide for the conveyance of a Forest Service site in Dolores County, Colorado, to be used for a fire station; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS
The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:
EC–4915. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.
EC–4917. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic that was declared in Executive Order 13687 of May 12, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.
EC–4918. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received in the Office of the President on April 16, 2018; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
EC–4919. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Strategic Plan for the Department of Health and Human Services for fiscal years 2018-2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
EC–4920. A communication from the Impact Analyst, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Schedule for Rating Disabilities: The Organ and System–Specific Rating Scale,” received in the Office of the President on April 16, 2018; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS
The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:
POM–199. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho memorializing its opposition to any new federal national monument designations or further designations of wilderness in the State of Idaho without the approval of the United States Congress and the Idaho Legislature; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 103
Whereas, the Antiquities Act was passed by the United States Congress and signed into law by President Theodore Roosevelt on June 8, 1906. The law gives the President of the United States the authority to, by presidential proclamation, create national monu-
mements from federal lands to protect significant, natural, cultural or scientific features. The law has been used more than one hun-
dred times since its passage.
Whereas, the Wilderness Act was passed in 1964 and, since that time, the United States Congress has designated nearly 110 million acres of federal wildland wilderness, which has the highest form of protection of any federal wildland; and
Whereas, almost sixty-two percent of land in Idaho is federal land; and
Whereas, residents of the State of Idaho support multiple use of public land. Current multiple use and private land protection policies governing the use of public land in Idaho have generally served and sustained the interests of Idaho residents; and
Whereas, ranching, agriculture, mining, the mining industry, and the primary economic drivers in the state, with agr-
an estimated $7.6 billion, the mining industry contributing $1.3 billion and the forestry industry contributing $2 billion to the economy annually in recent years, all of which would be impacted by any land management changes; and

Whereas, Idaho residents, families and visitors currently enjoy multiple use on federal lands and increased generations of family traditions. Changing federal land designations would impact local wildlife management as well as opportunities to hunt and fish; and

Whereas, changes in federal land designations or classifications would affect land use by imposing restrictions on development, recreation and other aspects of management changes that would result in diminished economic opportunities and restrictions on access and multiple use; and

Whereas, the people of the State of Idaho value abundant water resources and water rights and have concern that new national monument designations or further designation of wilderness by Congress could affect those resources and rights; and

Whereas, the Idaho Roadless Rule is Idaho's 2006 plan that provides a framework for use and changes in more than nine million acres of federal public backcountry. The rule is viewed as a nationwide model of collaboration among groups and individuals with diverse interests and concerns; and

Whereas, the Roadless Rule specifically prescribes protective management under the wildland recreation theme, and it is feared that new federal acts requiring coordination for new national monument designations or further designation of wilderness by Congress would overturn the agreement reached in the formulation of the Idaho Roadless Rule, with no effort to reach consensus through coordination as required by federal law; and

Whereas, several years ago, advisory votes relating to a suggested new national monument designation and a wilderness designation in Idaho were held in a number of potentially affected counties in central and eastern Idaho, both showing over ninety percent opposition to such designations. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of the Second Regular Session of the Sixty-fourth Idaho Legislature, the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring therein, that we oppose any new national monument designations or further designations of wilderness in the State of Idaho without the approval of the United States Congress and the Idaho Legislature; and be it further

Resolved, That the Idaho congressional delegation is urged to introduce and support legislation to oppose any new federal national monument designations or further designations of wilderness in the State of Idaho without the approval of the United States Congress and the Idaho Legislature; and be it further

Resolved, That any efforts to reach decisions regarding lands and resources of the State of Idaho determined by federal agencies or their designees be made through the lawful coordination process as required by the National Environmental Policy Act, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, the National Forest Management Act, the 1982 Forest Service Planning Rule and other federal acts requiring coordination, rather than by unilateral administrative policies that exclude the residents of the State of Idaho; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the congressional delegations representing the State of Idaho, the U.S. Department of State, the Columbia River Treaty Negotiator, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

POM-200. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho urging the Department of State to support several positions in negotiations with Canada regarding any recommendation of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations;

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 11

Whereas, since it was implemented in 1964, the Columbia River Treaty has provided for a coordinated management of the Columbia River to reduce flooding impacts and increase power generation throughout the Columbia River Basin; and

Whereas, the treaty provides that either the United States or Canada may terminate the treaty at least 10 years in advance of termination; and

Whereas, the U.S. and Canadian entities previously reviewed the treaty and determined that the treaty should be modified; and

Whereas, on December 7, 2017, the U.S. State Department issued a press release stating that the United States and Canada will begin negotiations to modernize the treaty in early 2018; and

Whereas, the U.S. Entity Regional Recommendation of 2013 concluded that the purposes of a "modified" treaty should be expanded to include consideration of "ecosystem-based function" in addition to the original flood control and hydropower purposes of the treaty; and

Whereas, unless otherwise agreed to, the treaty provides that flood control operations will automatically shift from providing guaranteed flood control space in Canadian reservoirs to "called upon" flood control operations; and

Whereas, the U.S. and Canadian entities have provided differing interpretations of the "called upon" flood control provisions, with the U.S. Entity interpreting that "called upon" operations apply only to dams in the Columbia River Basin specifically authorized for "system-wide flood control," and the Canadian Entity taking the position that all U.S. storage projects in the Columbia River Basin must be utilized for system-wide flood control before Canadian reservoirs are called upon to provide any flood control space; and

Whereas, altered flood control operations could have devastating impacts on reservoir storage and operation levels, irrigation, recreation, local flood control, and other authorized purposes in Idaho; and

Whereas, the Canadian Entity, whereby the U.S. and Canadian entities share the increased power production created by coordinated river operations, has proven to be imbalanced in favor of Canada; and

Whereas, including ecosystem-based function in a modernized treaty could have adverse impacts on existing beneficial uses of the river and create greater uncertainty in a river system that is already heavily regulated; and

Whereas, the Regional Recommendation fails to recognize the substantial investment made in hydropower made in the North-West region hydropower producers and their customers, including billions of dollars invested in fish passage and habitat efforts and the development and implementation of robust environmental mitigation plans; and

Whereas, navigation should be protected, and measures can be taken to not impact the transportation channel or lock system operations; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of the Second Regular Session of the Sixty-fourth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that we urge the U.S. Department of State to support the following positions of the Canadian delegation regarding any modification or future implementation of the Columbia River Treaty:

(1) Recognize and protect the authorized purposes and water rights for storage projects in Idaho, including irrigation, recreation, hydropower and local flood control;

(2) Recognize that certain projects specifically authorized by Congress for system-wide flood control may be required to provide such benefits under the treaty, with the increased flood control burden placed on projects in Idaho;

(3) Recognize a need to review and rebalance the Canadian Entitlement;

(4) Recognize the value and benefits that have already been provided by storage projects in the United States pursuant to the other federal laws and refrain from adversely affecting those ecosystem contributions from U.S. projects;

(5) Recognize that ecosystem restoration, as that term has been used by some proponents of modernization, is impossible and vague and if incorporated into an international treaty could be used as a vehicle to override and infringe upon existing federal, state, tribal and local sovereignty over water and, therefore, require any treaty modification to preserve federal environmental protection laws and state, tribal and local laws and reject any additional mitigation requirement;

(6) Require any treaty modification to recognize the primary authority and state sovereignty of Idaho and its sister states over the respective water resources of the Columbia River Basin; and

(7) Reject any attempts through the treaty modification process to incorporate the reintroduction of anadromous species above Hell's Canyon or Dworshak, as such efforts are outside the scope of the treaty purposes; and

(8) Protect navigation so that adverse flows do not impact the transportation channel or block system operations; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States, the U.S. Department of State, the Columbia River Treaty Negotiator, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Army, and the Bonneville Power Administration and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

POM-201. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming commemorating the one hundred fiftieth (150th) anniversary of the signing of the 1868 Treaty of Fort Bridger; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas, the Shoshone (eastern band) and the Bannock Tribes of Indians, presently known as the Eastern Shoshone and the Shoshone–Bannock Tribes, entered into a treaty with the United States of America on July 3, 1868 at Fort Bridger, in the Utah Territory, which is now present day Wyoming; and

Whereas, each of the Tribes and the United States Government desiring for peace to continue among and between themselves signed the 1868 Treaty of Fort Bridger to keep and maintain peace; and

Whereas, the legacy of the 1868 Treaty of Fort Bridger has had an impact in numerous ways on the lives of Tribal members of both Tribes from generation to generation since the signing; and

Whereas, members of both the Eastern Shoshone and the Shoshone–Bannock Tribes have endured difficult times navigating treacherous trails in their dedicated effort to preserve and pass along their
physical and cultural identity, while at the same time making significant contributions to the development of the Republic; and
Whereas, the Eastern Shoshone and Shoshone-Bannock Nations and their people continue to be integral components of American society. Now, therefore be it
Resolved...
POM-203. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho requesting a permanent exemption from the U.S. Department of Transportation—Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration electronic logging devices mandate granted by whichsoever means appropriate for livestock and agriculture commodity transporters; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 104

Whereas, the 2012 federal transportation bill, MAP-21, mandated electronic logging devices in commercial trucks, which were to be finalized by rule in 2015, with an implementation date of December 18, 2017, in trucks of model year 2000 and newer; and

Whereas, the nature of the commodities hauled and normal industry scheduling uncertainty, livestock and agriculture commodity haulers requested exemption from this mandated transition from hand-written logbooks to the electronic log, and the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) originally ignored the request and agriculture commodity haulers; and

Whereas, the federal mandate and rule decreased business revenue and does little or nothing to improve safety in this segment of the trucking industry, and USDOT–FMCSA has not considered the special surrounding transportation, fish and insects, as these are the most perishable and fragile of all commodities and must be transported in the most efficient, timely and expedient manner as possible, and conformity with the ELD mandate and existing hours of services rule would result in delays off-loading and reloading or even the addition of a second driver on short hauls; and

Whereas, infrastructure for off-loading and holding of livestock do not readily exist and, if it did, extra handling of cargo would result in added stress, weight loss, additional expense and exposure to additional disease and biohazard, with no positive benefit to the animals; and

Whereas, heavy machinery service vehicles often drive long distances to reach a job site and remain at the location long enough to exceed the service day thereby requiring either an additional driver or an overnight stay near the job site and subsequently decreasing efficiency and increasing business expenditure; and

Whereas, highway safety is also a primary consideration, and livestock transporters were involved in a statistically insignificant number of accidents (0.04%) according to the “Large Truck Crash Cause Study” published by the FMCSA and the National Highway Safety Institute and 0.7% of fatal accidents per the “Trucks Involved in Fatal Accidents Factbook 2005” published by the Transportation Research Institute; and

Whereas, ELDs engage when the truck’s motor is started. The devices provide the operator no discretion in determining “on-duty” and “off-duty” time. Large, over-the-road commercial truck drivers support the ELD mandate because they are better able to absorb related costs and are subject to well-defined schedules; and

Whereas, ELDs allow the driver this determination. Because many livestock and agriculture commodity haulers are small and independently owned businesses, manda-

tory ELD would result in increased livestock handling, more downtime, increased expenses, and lower net revenues to producers and trucking firms and small trucking companies forced out of business. The ELD mandate is impractical because USDOT–FMCSA did not consider normal delays that are encountered when dealing with livestock and other agriculture commodities; and

Whereas, in September 2017, seven national agriculture commodity transporters and other agriculture-related organizations requested a waiver from the rule, which was granted and will be in effect until March 18, 2020 (H.R. 3990); and Requirement for Electronic Logging Device, is contained in the FY18 federal Transportation, Housing and Urban Development (THUD) bill funding to implement the ELD mandate in FY18, and this language was signed by all members of Idaho’s congressional delega-
tion, and legislation was introduced in 2017 in the United States House of Representa-
tives to make a livestock/agriculture commodity exemption permanent; and

Whereas, the federal mandate and rule is difficult to implement, increases cost, lowers efficiency, imposes an unfunded mandate, creates economic and regulatory hardship for small business and does not consider the special needs of certain segments of the trucking industry; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of the Second Regular Session of the Sixty-fourth Idaho Legislative Assembly, the Senate and the House of Represen-
tatives concurring therein, that we request a permanent exemption from the USDOT–FMCSA ELD mandate granted by whichever means appropriate for livestock and agriculture commodity transporters; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, the Governor of the State of Idaho, the United States Department of Transportation and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

POM-204. A resolution approved by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Rice Lake, Wisconsin, supporting the passage of an amendment to the United States Constitution stating: only human beings are en-
dowed with Constitutional rights-not corpora-
tions, unions, non-profits or other artificial entities; and money is not speech, and therefore regulating political contributions and spending is not equivalent to limiting political speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. MACHIN:
S. 2681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for coal-powered electric generation units; to the Committee on Finance[.]

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. UDALL):
S. 2682. A bill to establish a student loan forgiveness plan for certain borrowers who are employed at a qualified farm or ranch; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.[

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. BROWN):
S. 2683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for coal-powered electric generation units; to the Committee on Finance[.]

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. UDALL):
S. 2684. A bill to establish a Federal student loan restructured repayment schedule for certain borrowers who are agricultural producers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.[

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. INFRESE):
S. 2685. A bill to modify certain require-
ments for farm ownership loan eligibility; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. PERDUE:
S. 2686. A bill to require Federal agencies to issue appropriate identification for the carrying of concealed firearms by qualified law enforcement officers and qualified re-
tired law enforcement officers; to the Com-
mittee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ:
S. 2687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the individual tax provisions of the tax reform law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. INFRESE):
S. 2688. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the indexing of certain assets for purposes of determining gain or loss; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. ROBERTS:
S. 2689. A bill to provide a taxpayer bill of rights for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. HARRIS):
S. 2691. A bill to hold pharmaceutical companies accountable for illegal marketing and distribution of opioid products and for their role in creating and exacerbating the opioid epidemic in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MACHIN:
S. Res. 470. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that electricity markets do not appropriately value the reliability and resilience attributes of baseload power generation serving the bulk power system; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. MACHIN):
S. Res. 471. A resolution designating March 26, 2018, as “Vietnam Veterans Day”; consid-
ered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. MACHIN):
S. Res. 472. A resolution designating April 5, 2018, as “Gold Star Wives Day”; consid-
ered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Delaware
At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TRSTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 515, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TRSTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to eliminate duties on imports of recreational performance outerwear, to establish the Sustainable Textile and Apparel Research Fund, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRANO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2047, a bill to restrict the use of funds for kinetic military operations in North Korea.

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2124, a bill to ensure the privacy and security of sensitive personal information, to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to provide notice of security breaches involving sensitive personal information, and to enhance law enforcement assistance and for other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personal information.

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STabenow) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2271, a bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act.

At the request of Ms. STabenow, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2540, a bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusettts (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2555, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to establish the Dairy Farm Sustainability Price Loss Coverage Program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2578, a bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Commerce to provide advanced notice to Congress before changing any questions on the decennial census, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2642, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to establish a pilot program for Jobs Plus Recovery programs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2663, a bill to modify and improve provisions relating to environmental requirements for agriculture and agricultural producers, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAACSON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2680, a bill to address the opioid crisis.

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2680, supra.

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. J. Res. 57, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act".

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from Massachusettts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 459, a resolution recognizing "Black Maternal Health Week" to bring national attention to the maternal health care crisis in the Black community and the importance of reducing the rate of maternal mortality and morbidity among Black women.

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 460, a resolution condemning Boko Haram and calling on the Governments of the United States of America and Nigeria to swiftly implement measures to defeat the terrorist organization.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 463, a resolution authorizing a Senator to bring a grandchild or daughter of the Senator onto the floor of the Senate during votes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2689. A bill to provide a taxpayer bill of rights for small businesses; to protect trade secrets; to provide a tax credit for mergers and acquisitions; and for other purposes.

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Taxpayer Bill of Rights Act of 2018".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Modification of standards for awarding of costs and certain fees.
Sec. 3. Civil damages allowed for reckless or intentional disregard of internal revenue laws.
Sec. 4. Modifications relating to certain offenses by officers and employees in connection with revenue laws.
Sec. 5. Modifications relating to civil damages for unauthorized inspection or disclosure of returns and return information.
Sec. 6. Ban on ex parte discussions.
Sec. 7. Right to independent conference.
Sec. 8. Alternative dispute resolution procedures.
Sec. 9. Increase in monetary penalties for certain unauthorized disclosures of information.
Sec. 10. Ban on raising new issues on appeal.
Sec. 11. Limitation on enforcement of liens against principal residences.
Sec. 2. Modifications of Standards for Awarding of Costs and Certain Fees.

(a) Small Businesses Eligible Without Regard to Net Worth—Subparagraph (D) of section 7430(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” and, at the end of clause (iv), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new clause: “(iii) In the case of an eligible small business, the net worth limitation in clause (ii) of such section shall not apply.”

(b) Eligible Small Business—Paragraph (4) of section 7429 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph: “(F) Eligible small business.—(1) In general. For purposes of subparagraph (D)(iii), the term ‘eligible small business’ means, with respect to any proceeding commenced in a taxable year—

(1) a corporation the stock of which is not publicly traded,

(2) a partnership, or

(3) a sole proprietorship,

if the average annual gross receipts of such corporation, partnership, or sole proprietorship for the taxable year preceding such taxable year does not exceed $50,000,000. For purposes of applying the test under the preceding sentence, rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 48(c) shall apply.

(2) Adjustment for Inflation.—In the case of any calendar year after 2018, the $50,000,000 amount in clause (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2017’ for ‘calendar year 2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

If any amount as increased under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $500, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $500.”.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 3. Civil Damages Allowed for Recklessness or Intentional Disregard of Internal Revenue Laws.

(a) Increase in Amount of Damages.—

(1) In General.—Section 7430(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “$1,000,000 ($100,000, in the case of negligence)” and inserting “$5,000,000 ($500,000, in the case of negligence)”.

(b)滾動調整額。—Subparagraph (A)(ii) of section 7430(c)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new clause: “(iii) In the case of any calendar year after 2018, the $10,000 amount in subsection (a) and the $25,000 amount in subsection (b) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2017’ for ‘calendar year 2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

If any amount as increased under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $500, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $500.”.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 4. Modifications Relating to Certain Officers and Employees in Connection with Revenue Laws.

(a) Increase in Penalty.—Section 7214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “$10,000” in subsection (a) and inserting “$25,000”, and

(2) by striking “$5,000” in subsection (b) and inserting “$10,000”.

(b) Adjustment for Inflation.—Section 7214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2017’ for ‘calendar year 2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

If any amount as increased under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $500, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $100.”.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 5. Modifications Relating to Civil Damages for Unauthorized In-Sourcing or Disclosure of Returns and Return Information.

(a) Increase in Amount of Damages.—Subparagraph (A)(i)(A) of section 7431(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2017’ for ‘calendar year 2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

If any amount as increased under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $500, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $500.”.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 6. Ban on Ex Parte Discussions.

(a) In General.—Notwithstanding section 1001(a)(4) of the Internal Revenue Service Re-structuring and Reform Act of 1998, the Internal Revenue Service shall prohibit any ex parte communications between officers in the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals and other Internal Revenue Service employees with respect to any matter pending before such officers.

(2) Termination of Employment for Misconduct.—Subject to the Secretary’s determination that employee committed any act or omission prohibited under subsection (a) in the performance of the employee’s official duties, such termination shall be without removal for cause on charges of misconduct.

(3) Determination of Commissioner.—

(a) In General.—The Commissioner of Internal Revenue may take a personnel action other than termination for an act prohibited under subsection (a).

(b) Discretion.—The exercise of authority under paragraph (a) shall be at the sole discretion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and may not be delegated to any other officer. At the sole discretion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, such employee may establish a procedure which will be used to determine whether an individual should be referred to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for a determination by the Commissioner under paragraph (1).

(3) No Appeal.—Any determination of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under this subsection may not be appealed in any administrative or judicial proceeding.

Sec. 7. Right to Independent Conference.

Section 1001 of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) Right to Independent Conference.—Under the organization plan of the Internal Revenue Service, a taxpayer shall have the right to a conference with the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals which does not include personnel from the Office of Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service or the compliance functions of the Internal Revenue Service unless the taxpayer specifically consents to the participation of such personnel.”

Sec. 8. Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures.

(a) In General.—Section 7213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) Availability of Dispute Resolution—

(1) In General.—The procedures prescribed under subsection (b)(1) and the pilot program established under subsection (b)(2) shall provide that a taxpayer may request mediation or arbitration in any case unless the Secretary has specifically excluded the type of issue involved in such case or the class of cases to which such case belongs as not appropriate for resolution under such subsection. The Secretary shall make any determination that excludes a type of issue or a class of cases public within 5 working days of the mediation or arbitration request and shall provide an explanation for each determination.

(2) Independent Mediators.—

(a) In General.—The procedures prescribed under subsection (b)(1) shall provide the taxpayer an opportunity to elect to have the mediation conducted by an independent, respectively.
neutral individual not employed by the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals.

(b) Costs and Selection.—

(1) In General.—Any taxpayer making an election under subparagraph (A) shall be required—

(b) Costs and Selection.—

(i) To share the costs of such independent mediator equally with the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals.

(ii) To limit the selection of the mediator to a roster of recognized national or local neutral mediators.

(c) Election by Mediator.—Clause (ii) shall not apply to any taxpayer who is an individual or who was a small business in the preceding calendar year who had an adjusted gross income that did not exceed 250 percent of the poverty level, as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in the taxable year preceding the request.

(iii) Small Business.—For purposes of clause (i), the term ‘small business’ has the meaning given such term under section 7213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(ii) To determine whether a case is within the scope of the initial determination.

(a) To the extent the taxpayer requests, the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals shall—

(1) provide a transcript of the hearing;

(2) permit a taxpayer to be represented by counsel;

(3) afford the taxpayer an opportunity to present evidence and argument on the issues in dispute;

(4) permit the taxpayer to make a reply to objections raised by the Service.

(b) Social Security Disability Insurance or Supplemental Security Income.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. Increase in Monetary Penalties for Certain Audits, Inspections, and Disclosures of Information.

(a) In General.—Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 7862(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are amended by striking "$5,000" and inserting "$10,000".

(b) Adjustment for Inflation.—Subsection (b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

(c) Special Matters.

(1) Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year, as shall be in effect for calendar year 2017 for calendar year 2016 in subparagraph (A)(i) thereof.

(1) In General.—In any case and inserting the following:

(ii) by adding to the comments at the end the following:

(ii) by adding to the comments at the end the following:

(i) by inserting "and" at the end of subparagraph (A).

(2) The Secretary may by regulation provide that an amount equal to so much of the qualified mortgage interest deduction for the taxable year as is allocable to a secured transaction that is required to be reported under section 609(A) shall be taken into account as income for purposes of this paragraph.

(b) Limitation with Respect to Principal Residence.

(1) In General.—In any case and inserting the following:

(1) In any case, and

(b) Limitation with Respect to Principal Residence.

(1) In General.—Subsection (a) shall apply to any person other than—

(1) the Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

(2) any employee who is employed by the Internal Revenue Service on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 10. Ban on Raising New Issues on Appeals.

(a) In General.—Subsection (k)(1) of section 3D of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as paragraph (E);

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new paragraph:

(b) Exceptions.

(1) by striking "and" and inserting "and".

(b) Limitation on Alternative Punishment.

(2) by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (6).


(b) Procedures for Repeal.—

(i) The procedures described in section 8D(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 shall not apply to any auditor who is a taxpayer who has been found to be an individual or a small business in the preceding calendar year.

(ii) The procedures described in section 8D(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 shall not apply to any auditor who is a taxpayer who has been found to be an individual or a small business in the preceding calendar year.

(iii) The procedures described in section 8D(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 shall not apply to any auditor who is a taxpayer who has been found to be an individual or a small business in the preceding calendar year.

(b) Procedures for Repeal.—

(i) The procedures described in section 8D(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 shall not apply to any auditor who is a taxpayer who has been found to be an individual or a small business in the preceding calendar year.

(ii) The procedures described in section 8D(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 shall not apply to any auditor who is a taxpayer who has been found to be an individual or a small business in the preceding calendar year.

(iii) The procedures described in section 8D(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 shall not apply to any auditor who is a taxpayer who has been found to be an individual or a small business in the preceding calendar year.

 SEC. 11. Limitation on Enforcement of Liens Against Principal Residence.

(a) In General.—Subsection (a) of section 7060(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(i) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(1) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(1) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(1) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(1) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(1) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(1) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(1) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(1) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(i) In General.—Subsection (a) shall apply to any property used as the principal residence of the taxpayer (within the meaning of section 121) unless the Secretary of the Treasury makes a written determination that—

(i) the taxpayer is entitled to or is using as his principal residence;

(ii) the property is necessary for the taxpayer's business; or

(iii) the property is a gift to the taxpayer.

(b) Delegation.—For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary of the Treasury may delegate any responsibilities under subparagraph (B) to any employee of the Treasury that is required pursuant to section 8D of the Inspector General Act of 1978.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to actions commenced after the date of the enactment of this Act.


(a) Termination of Unemployment for Inappropriate Review of Tax-Exempt Status.—Subsection (a) of section 1203(a) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 (26 U.S.C. 7804 note) is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (k)(1), by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (k)(3), and by inserting "and" at the end of paragraph (k)(5).

(b) Repeal.—Section 8D of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (i).

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.


(a) Review.—Subsection (k)(1) of section 3D of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(i) In General.—Section 7060(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(ii) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(iii) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(iv) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(v) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(vi) by striking "In any case" and inserting the following:

(b) Procedures for Repeal.—

(i) The procedures described in section 8D(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 shall not apply to any auditor who is a taxpayer who has been found to be an individual or a small business in the preceding calendar year.

(ii) The procedures described in section 8D(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 shall not apply to any auditor who is a taxpayer who has been found to be an individual or a small business in the preceding calendar year.

(iii) The procedures described in section 8D(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 shall not apply to any auditor who is a taxpayer who has been found to be an individual or a small business in the preceding calendar year.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.


(a) In General.—Subsection (a) of section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

(b) Deduction for Expenses Relating to Certain Audits.—The deduction allowed by section 224.

SEC. 224. Expenses Relating to Certain Audits.

(a) Allowance of Deduction.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to so much of the qualified
SEC. 17. REPEAL OF PARTIAL PAYMENT REQUIREMENT ON SUBMISSIONS OF OFFERS-IN-COMPROMISE.

(a) In General.—Section 7122 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsection (c) and by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

(b) Conforming Amendments.—

(1) Paragraph (3) of section 7122(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by inserting “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking “, and” at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting a period, and by striking subparagraph (C).

(2) Section 7122 of such Code, as amended by this section, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) Application of Fx.—In the case of any assessed tax or other amounts imposed under this title with respect to such tax which is the subject of an offer-in-compromise, such tax or other amounts shall be reduced by any user fee imposed under this title with respect to such offer-in-compromise.”.

(3) Section 6159(g) of such Code is amended by striking “section 7122(e)” and inserting “section 7122(d)(i)”.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section apply to offers-in-compromise submitted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 15. TERM LIMIT FOR NATIONAL TAXPAYER ADVOCATE.

(a) In General.—Subparagraph (B) of section 7803(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(v) Term.—The term of the National Taxpayer Advocate shall be a 10-year term, beginning with a term to commence on the date which is 18 months after the date of the enactment of the Small Business Taxpayer Bill of Rights Act of 2018. Each subsequent term shall begin on the day after the date on which the previous term expires. The National Taxpayer Advocate may be appointed to serve more than 1 term.”.

(b) Effective Date.—The term of any individual serving as the National Taxpayer Advocate pursuant to section 7803(c)(1)(B)(v) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Determination of Economic Hardship.—Subsection (a) of section 6343 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(x) the nature and extent of the hardship created by the levy (including whether the taxpayer has exercised ordinary business care and prudence), and

“(y) the potential harm to individuals if the business is liquidated.”.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section apply to offers-in-compromise submitted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 16. RELEASE OF IRS LEVY DUE TO ECONOMIC HARDSHIP FOR BUSINESS TAXPAYER.

(a) In General.—Subparagraph (D) of section 6343(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “or” and inserting “including the financial condition of the taxpayer’s viable trade or business, or”.

(b) Determination of Economic Hardship.—Subsection (a) of section 6343 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Determination of Economic Hardship.—In determining whether to release any levy under paragraph (1)(D), the Secretary shall consider—

“(A) the economic viability of the business,

“(B) the nature and extent of the hardship created by the levy (including whether the taxpayer has exercised ordinary business care and prudence, and

“(C) the potential harm to individuals if the business is liquidated.”.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section apply to offers-in-compromise submitted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. RES. 470

Whereas the power generation resource mix of the United States is rapidly changing, presenting ongoing challenges to ensuring that baseload units remain operational and provide enhanced resilience and reliability to the power grid of the United States;

Whereas many baseload units are not appropriately valued for the resilience and reliability attributes those units provide to the power grid of the United States;

Whereas accelerated retirements of coal-fired and nuclear baseload power generation resources are among those challenges, including how to support the combat operations from Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and the civilian Navy vessels;

Whereas, on January 27, 1973, the Agreement on Ending the War in Vietnam and Restoring Peace (commonly known as the “Paris Peace Accords”) was signed, which required the release of all United States prisoners-of-war held in North Vietnam and the withdrawal of all United States Armed Forces from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on March 29, 1973, the United States Armed Forces ground combat units arrived in the Republic of Vietnam to join an already present 23,000 United States Armed Forces personnel;

Whereas, by September 6, 1973, there were between 150,000 and 190,000 United States Armed Forces troops in Vietnam; and by 1969, a peak number of United States Armed Forces troops in Vietnam of approximately 589,500 troops was reached, including United States Armed Forces ground combat units supporting the combat operations from Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and aboard Navy vessels;

Whereas, on September 28, 1962, the Vietnamese regular forces captured Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam, effectively placing South Vietnam under Communist control;

Whereas, in 1965, United States Armed Forces ground combat units arrived in the Republic of Vietnam to join an already present 23,000 United States Armed Forces personnel;

Whereas, in 1965, United States Armed Forces ground combat units arrived in the Republic of Vietnam to join an already present 23,000 United States Armed Forces personnel;

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission should take action to ensure that the electricity markets fully recognize the reliability and resilience benefits of coal-fired and nuclear baseload power generation resources serving the bulk power system.

S. RESOLUTION 471—DESIGNATING MARCH 29, 2018, AS “VIETNAM VETERANS DAY”

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Whereas the Vietnam War was fought in the Republic of Vietnam from 1955 to 1975 and involved regular forces from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and Viet Cong guerilla forces in armed conflict with the United States Armed Forces, the armed forces of allies of the United States, and the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas the United States Armed Forces became involved in Vietnam because the United States Government wanted to provide direct support by the Armed Forces to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to fight against the threat of Communism from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas members of the United States Armed Forces began serving in an advisory role to the Government of South Vietnam in 1955;

Whereas as a result of the Gulf of Tonkin incidents on August 2 and 4, 1964, Congress overwhelmingly passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution (Public Law 88–402) on August 7, 1964, which provided the President of the United States the authority to use armed force to assist the Republic of Vietnam in the defense of its freedom against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas, in 1965, United States Armed Forces ground combat units arrived in the Republic of Vietnam to join an already present 23,000 United States Armed Forces personnel;
the United States and a conflict that caused a generation of veterans to wait too long for the United States public to acknowledge and honor the efforts and services of those veterans.

Whereas members of the United States Armed Forces who served bravely and faithfully for the United States during the Vietnam War were wrongly criticized for the decisions of policymakers that were beyond the control of those members of the United States Armed Forces; and

Whereas designating March 29, 2018, as "Vietnam Veterans Day" would be an appropriate way to honor the members of the United States Armed Forces who served in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War; and

Whereas the sacrifices of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States should never be forgotten.

Resolved, That the Senate—
(i) designates March 29, 2018, as "Vietnam Veterans Day";
(ii) honors and recognizes the contributions of veterans who served in the United States Armed Forces in Vietnam during war and during peace;
(iii) encourages States and local governments to designate March 29, 2018, as "Vietnam Veterans Day";
(iv) encourages the people of the United States to observe Vietnam Veterans Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities that—
(A) provide the appreciation that veterans of the Vietnam War deserve;
(B) demonstrate that we resolve that the people of the United States shall never forget the sacrifices and service of a generation of veterans who served in the Vietnam War;
(C) promote awareness of the faithful service and contributions of the veterans of the Vietnam War—
(i) during service in the United States Armed Forces;
(ii) to the communities of the veterans since returning home;
(D) promote awareness of the importance of entire communities empowering veterans and the families of veterans in helping the veterans readjust to civilian life after service in the United States Armed Forces; and
(E) promote opportunities for veterans of the Vietnam War—
(i) to assist younger veterans returning from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in re habilitation from wounds, both seen and unseen; and
(ii) to support the reintegration of younger veterans into civilian life.

SENATE RESOLUTION 472—DESIGNATING APRIL 5, 2018, AS "GOLD STAR WIVES DAY"

Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. ENOFEE, and Mr. HELLER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 472

Whereas the Senate honors the sacrifices made by the spouses and families of the fallen members of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. represents the spouses and families of the fallen members of the Armed Forces of the United States who have died on active duty or as a result of a service-connected disability;

Whereas the primary mission of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. is to provide services, support, and fellowship to the spouses of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas, in 1945, Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. was organized with the help of Eleanor Roosevelt to assist the families left behind by the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas the first meeting of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. was held on April 5, 1945;

Whereas April 5, 2018, marks the 73rd anniversary of the first meeting of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc.;

Whereas the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States bear the burden of protecting the freedom of the people of the United States; and

Whereas the sacrifices of the families of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States should never be forgotten;

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) designates April 5, 2018, as "Gold Star Wives Day";
(2) honors and recognizes—
(A) the contributions of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc.; and
(B) the dedication of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. to the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; and
(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe Gold Star Wives Day to promote awareness of—
(A) the contributions and dedication of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. to the memories of the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States; and
(B) the important role that Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. plays in the lives of the spouses and families of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2238. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. HASSAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1281, to establish a bug bounty pilot program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2238. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. HASSAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1281, to establish a bug bounty pilot program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 8, line 21, strike "90 days" and insert "180 days.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 17, 2018, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Thelma Drake, of Virginia, to be Federal Transit Administrator, Department of Transportation; Jeffrey Nadaner, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce; and Seth Daniel Appleton, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 17, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Karl L. Schultz, to be Admiral and to be Commandant of the Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 17, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON SEAPower

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 17, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 70–770, the appointment of the following individual to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: the Honorable John N. Boozman of Arkansas.

HACK THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 335, S. 1281.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 335, S. 1281.
There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, 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 “Hack the Department of Homeland Security Act of 2017” or the “Hack DHS Act”.

**SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BUG BOUNTY PILOT PROGRAM.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
(1) BUG BOUNTY PROGRAM.—The term “bug bounty program” means the bug bounty pilot program under which an approved individual, organization, or company is temporarily authorized to identify and report vulnerabilities of Internet-facing information technology of the Department in exchange for compensation.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish, within the Office of the Chief Information Officer, a bug bounty pilot program to minimize vulnerabilities of Internet-facing information technology of the Department.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In establishing the pilot program, the Secretary shall—
(A) provide compensation for reports of previously unidentified security vulnerabilities within the websites, applications, and other Internet-facing information technology of the Department that are accessible to the public;
(B) award a competitive contract to an entity, as necessary, to manage the pilot program and for executing the remediation of vulnerabilities identified as a consequence of the pilot program;
(C) designate mission-critical operations with- in the Department that should be excluded from the pilot program;
(D) consult with the relevant offices at the Department of Homeland Security and the Attorney General on how to ensure that approved individuals, organizations, or companies that comply with the requirements of the pilot program are protected from prosecution under section 1030 of title 18, United States Code, and similar provisions of law for specific activities authorized under the pilot program;
(E) develop an expeditious process by which an approved individual, organization, or company can register with the entity described in subparagraph (B), submit to a background check as determined by the Department, and receive a determination as to eligibility for participation in the pilot program; and
(F) engage qualified interested persons, including non-government sector representatives, about the structure of the pilot program as constructive and to the extent practicable.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the pilot program is completed, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program, which are required to be established under subsection (b)(1).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department $250,000 for fiscal year 2018 to carry out this Act.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Hous- san amendment be considered and agreed to, the committee-reported sub- stitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The amendment (No. 2238) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)
On page 8, line 21, strike “90 days” and in- seet “180 days” TDF, as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 1281
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Rep- resentatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**
This Act may be cited as the “Hack the Department of Homeland Security Act of 2017” or the “Hack DHS Act”.

**SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BUG BOUNTY PILOT PROGRAM.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
(1) BUG BOUNTY PROGRAM.—The term “bug bounty program” means a program under which an approved individual, organization, or company is temporarily authorized to identify and report vulnerabilities of Internet-facing information technology of the Department.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish, within the Office of the Chief Information Officer, a bug bounty pilot program to minimize vulnerabilities of Internet-facing information technology of the Department.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In establishing the pilot program, the Secretary shall—
(A) provide compensation for reports of previously unidentified security vulnerabilities within the websites, applications, and other Internet-facing information technology of the Department in exchange for compensation;

(3) the number of previously unidentified sec- urity vulnerabilities remediated as a result of the pilot program; and

(4) the current number of outstanding pre- viously unidentified security vulnerabilities and Department remediation plans.

(3) the number of previously unidentified sec- urity vulnerabilities remediated as a result of the pilot program; and

(4) the current number of outstanding pre- viously unidentified security vulnerabilities and Department remediation plans.

(5) REQUIREMENTS.—In establishing the pilot program, the Secretary shall—
(A) provide compensation for reports of previously unidentified security vulnerabilities within the websites, applications, and other Internet-facing information technology of the Department.

(2) award a competitive contract to an entity, as necessary, to manage the pilot program and for executing the remediation of vulnerabilities identified as a consequence of the pilot program;

(3) designate mission-critical operations with- in the Department that should be excluded from the pilot program;

(4) consult with the relevant offices at the Department of Homeland Security and the Attorney General on how to ensure that approved individuals, organizations, or companies that comply with the requirements of the pilot program are protected from prosecution under section 1030 of title 18, United States Code, and similar provisions of law for specific activities authorized under the pilot program;

(5) develop an expeditious process by which an approved individual, organization, or company can register with the entity described in subparagraph (B), submit to a background check as determined by the Department, and receive a determination as to eligibility for participation in the pilot program; and

(6) engage qualified interested persons, in- cluding non-government sector representa- tives, about the structure of the pilot pro- gram as constructive and to the extent practicable.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the pilot program is completed, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Secu- rity of the House of Representatives a re- port on the pilot program, which shall in- clude—

(1) the number of approved individuals, or- ganizations, or companies involved in the pilot program, broken down by the number of approved individuals, organizations, or companies that—
(A) registered;
(B) were approved;
(C) submitted security vulnerabilities; and
(D) received compensation;
(2) the number of previously unidentified vulnerabilities reported as part of the pilot program;
(3) the number of previously unidentified sec- urity vulnerabilities remediated as a result of the pilot program;
(4) the current number of outstanding pre- viously unidentified security vulnerabilities and Department remediation plans.

(5) the average length of time between the re- moving the current number of outstanding security vulnerabilities remediated as a result of the pilot program; and

(6) the lessons learned from the pilot program.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department $250,000 for fiscal year 2018 to carry out this Act.
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.

VIETNAM VETERANS DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 471, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 471) designating March 29, 2018, as "Vietnam Veterans Day." There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 471) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 471) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator THUNE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Dakota.

GOLD STAR WIVES DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 472, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 472) designating April 5, 2018, as "Gold Star Wives Day." There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 472) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator THUNE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Dakota.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I want to speak today to the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2017, of which I am a cosponsor. As chairman of the Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Coast Guard, I am proud that we were able to bring this important bipartisan legislation, which was originally introduced by Senator SULLIVAN, to the floor today for consideration. The bill that we are debating will increase our national security, protect our maritime industry, increase safety for the boating public, and provide consistency for those who depend on the water for their daily work.

As anyone impacted by the 2017 hurricane season will tell you, the Coast Guard plays a vitally important role in our Nation’s first response efforts. Equally critical is the Coast Guard’s role as a member of our U.S. military. Coast Guard women and men protect our waterways, defend our shores, interdict contraband, arrest human traffickers, guarantee the free movement of commerce, and ensure the stewardship of our national resources. On any given day, the Coast Guard responds to an average of 45 search and rescue missions, seizes 1,500 pounds of drugs, intercepts 17 illegal migrants, conducts 16 search and rescue missions, and facilitates the movement of $12.6 billion worth of goods. These professionals do their job without seeking recognition or acknowledgement. It often goes overlooked that our coastguardsmen are serving across every ocean and on every continent, including Antarctica. They serve across the Middle East, including in both Iraq and Afghanistan. These professionals are often the first to protect our Navy’s ships, defend against pirates, and ensure our strategic ports remain open.

This legislation provides the Coast Guard the authority to better carry out those missions, including our critical ballistic submarines when they are surfaced and at their most vulnerable. In one way or another, the Coast Guard affects every American, even in my home State of South Dakota. We may not have a coastline, but the work of the Coast Guard helps facilitate the export of agricultural products that drive our State’s economy.

The Coast Guard also provides boating safety classes and outreach to tens of thousands of recreational boaters. This bill increases boating safety for all, as well. You will hear from some of my colleagues that this act reduces environmental controls and is being jammed through Congress. This is simply not the case. We have negotiated in good faith for hundreds of hours, over the past few Congresses, to make this a strong piece of bipartisan legislation. We need strict, science-based, and achievable environmental standards, and that is what this VIDA title will yield.

The new standards must be based on the best available technology that is
economically achievable and are designed to become more stringent over time as technology improves. Setting limits beyond what is achievable may make for a good sound bite, but it doesn’t actually improve the environment. This bill will.

Like so much of the work we do at the Commerce Committee, Senator Nelson and I have worked hard to ensure the bipartisan Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2017 can garner strong support on both sides of the aisle. The measure meets the operational needs of the Coast Guard, allowing the service to continue to do the job that so many of our constituents rely on. It reauthorizes the FMC and NOAA’s hydrographic services. Finally, it provides needed regulatory certainty for recreational and commercial vessel operators, while ensuring strong environmental protections for our Nation’s waterways.

We are going to have an opportunity to vote on this tomorrow. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the men and women of the Coast Guard and to support this bipartisan legislation that has been negotiated for weeks, months, and years to bring us to where we are today—working to accommodate the concerns of individual Senators on both sides of the aisle but finding a balanced bill that should attract broad bipartisan support. I hope when that vote comes tomorrow, we will be able to see Members on both sides support this legislation and the men and women of the Coast Guard, who do so much important work for our country.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 18, 2018.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:24 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 18, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

DAVID FABIAN BLACK, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2019. VICE CAROLYN W. COLVIN, TERM EXPIRED.

ANDREW M. SAUL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2025. (REAPPOINTMENT)

ALEXANDER CRENSHAW, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS. VICE MARK GREEN, TERM EXPIRED.

LOUIS DEJOY, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2020. VICE MICHAEL JAMES WARREN, TERM EXPIRED.

FREDERICK PERPALL, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2020. VICE JAMES M. DIMERS, TERM EXPIRED.

SUSAN M. MCCUE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2021. (REAPPOINTMENT)

VICTORIA ANN HUGHES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

HEATHER REYNOLDS, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 14, 2021. VICE DEAN A. REUTER, TERM EXPIRED.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

GINA HASPEL, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, VICE MIKE POMPEO.
For the following text, the entries are as follows:

**TRIBUTE TO STEVE AUSTIN**

**HON. LISA BLUNT ROCHester**
**OF DELAWARE**
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**
**Tuesday, April 17, 2018**

Ms. BLUNT ROCHester. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of my colleagues Senator Tom CARPER and Senator Chris COONS of Delaware, to honor and congratulate Steve Austin, a Delaware Fire Service veteran and recipient of the Congressional Fire Services Institute’s (CFSI) 2018 Mason Lankford Fire Leadership Award.

A selfless citizen, Steve served the people of Newark in one of the state’s largest volunteer fire companies after joining the fire service in 1963. His willingness to help others has been a source of comfort to Delawareans experiencing times of overwhelming loss and tragedy. Steve’s sacrifice and volunteer spirit is a testament to his character.

Steve’s work was essential to the formation of the CFSI in 1989 and since then, he has dedicated his life to advancing the health and safety of firefighters across the nation for more than three decades. His life-long passion is evident in his founding of the Emergency Responder Safety Institute and Delaware Chapter of International Arson Investigators. Steve has been a powerful advocate at the local, state and federal level on issues that affect the ability of first responders to safely resolve dangerous situations and continue living a long, healthy life.

Steve is an extraordinary ambassador for all emergency personnel and is much deserving of the CFSI’s 2018 Fire Leadership Award. I want to extend my heartfelt gratitude and sincerest congratulations to Steve for receiving the CFSI Leadership Award and for his devotion to the people of Delaware. The First State is lucky to have members of the community who volunteer their time and sacrifice their lives for the greater good. Steve, like many other emergency workers will tell you, “I’m just doing my job.”

**REMEMBERING LEONARD STEFANELLI**

**HON. JOHN GARAMENDI**
**OF CALIFORNIA**
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**
**Tuesday, April 17, 2018**

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Leonard Stefanelli, a native Californian who embodied the American spirit of hard work and determination.

Leonard was the son of immigrants in San Francisco, and after graduating high school he took a job as a garbage collector for the Sunset Scavenger company. Through his hard work, he quickly rose up the ranks, and just 12 years after he started out on the back of a truck, he became president of the company.

Not content with his personal success however, Leonard used his role as president to begin implementing changes that would improve the entire industry. He reformed the way trash was collected in San Francisco, doing away with the old time-intensive practices that often resulted in backbreaking work for collectors. He continued modernizing both the company and the industry throughout his career.

Leonard was also proud of his service in the U.S. Navy aboard submarines, and of course, his family, including his wife, Virginia, and his children, Joseph and Gina. I know that they, along with the rest of his family and friends, join me in celebrating his life and his memory.

**HAPPY BIRTHDAY MICHAEL MULLINS**

**HON. BRUCE POLIQUIN**
**OF MAINE**
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**
**Tuesday, April 17, 2018**

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to wish Mr. Michael A. Mullins a very happy 80th birthday, which he celebrated on February 1. Mr. Mullins faithfully served our country for 40 years in the U.S. Army and as a civil servant with the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency before his retirement in 2001.

I would like to thank Michael for his service to the United States, and wish him a year full of blessings and good health.

**RECOGNIZING BETTY BABCOCK**

**HON. JOHN KATKO**
**OF NEW YORK**
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**
**Tuesday, April 17, 2018**

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer Betty Babcock, of the Onondaga Nation’s Snipe Clan my best wishes on the celebration of her 95th birthday on April 22nd.

Meaning “People of the Hills,” the Onondaga Nation and people celebrate a rich and vibrant culture. Standing as the “Keepers of the Fire” due to their central location, the Onondaga served as the keystone to the great Iroquois Confederacy, forming a system of governance that inspired America’s founding fathers in crafting the Constitution of the United States. In a storied and respected society where matriarchy is especially revered, Betty certainly the keeper of her family’s heart, embodying an inextinguishable flame.

Betty has a close-knit family including: her husband of sixty years Milton, daughter Darlene, grandchildren Betty and Eric; and her brother Oscar. Family has always played a key role in Betty’s life; as a young teenager, Betty became responsible for raising her younger brothers and sister, and maintains her dedication to her family to this day. Betty’s first job was at the offices of Syracuse Attorney Bob Daugherty, after which she opened and operated a very successful restaurant. She has always been known for her generosity, sense of humor and wonderful meals.

The celebration of Betty’s 95th birthday is a truly momentous occasion. Betty has witnessed great milestones in our Nation’s history, and I am honored to wish her a happy birthday.

---

*This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.*

*Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.*
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor his Holiness Sri Ravi Shankar, a Hindu spiritual leader and humanitarian who has devoted his life to eliminating violence and spreading compassion throughout the world.

His Holiness’s teachings center on the importance of spirituality and its ability to enhance personal traits such as enthusiasm, love, and compassion. According to his teachings on spirituality, the bond that all humans share is stronger than any other characteristic that divides us, be it religion, race, or nationality.

His Holiness has also taken part in extensive humanitarian work across the world, from organizing volunteers for many natural disasters over the past twenty years, including assistance for victims of the 2004 tsunami and Hurricane Katrina, to dedicating efforts to promoting interfaith dialogue through the Board of World Religious Leaders for the Elijah Interfaith Institute.

In addition, His Holiness has played a large role in the development of social initiatives all over the world, and especially in India. He is involved in Volunteer For a Better India, an organization which promotes voter awareness and registration as well as free health camps in India. In 2009, His Holiness established Sri Sri University in Odisha; in 2017, the school was awarded a Best Innovative University Award at the 2017 Education Excellence Awards.

In recognition of his contributions to the promotion of global values, His Holiness has received the highest awards of many countries, including India, Colombia, Peru, and Paraguay. In 2016, the Government of India awarded him the “Padmini Vibhushan,” India’s second highest civilian award.

Today, I recognize his Holiness Sri Ravi Shankar for all that he has done to promote peace, empathy, and acceptance in our world. I commend him for the good work he has done through both his teachings and his humanitarian service, and I thank him for his continued efforts to make the world a better place.

REVEREND JOHN ANDERSON
HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Reverend John Anderson for receiving the 2017 Image from the Arvada Chamber of Commerce.

Each year the Arvada Chamber recognizes Arvada’s finest men and women for their involvement and dedication to the community. Rev. Anderson’s positive outlook and impact has helped bring the Arvada community together and address a variety of disparities, specifically as it relates to education.

Congratulations to Rev. John Anderson for this well-deserved award, and I thank him for his contribution to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF BOB PRICE, SUNDAY DISPATCH PERSON OF THE YEAR
HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bob Price, who was named the Greater Pittston Sunday Dispatch’s Person of the Year for 2018. The Sunday Dispatch Person of the Year award recognizes the person who has had the greatest impact on life in the Greater Pittston area. Bob will be honored by the Sunday Dispatch and his community on May 8, 2018.

Bob resides in Dupont, Pennsylvania with his wife of 28 years, Ellen. He is a 1979 graduate of Wyoming Area High School. After high school, Bob attended Penn State University and received degrees in Electrical Engineering and Telecommunications Technology. He currently works as the Regional Fleet Manager for Johnson Controls in Allentown.

Bob is well known throughout the Greater Pittston Area for the active role he takes in his community. He currently serves as the president of the Dupont Borough Crime Watch and is a member of the Lions Club. Along with fifteen other volunteers, Bob formed the Progress Committee in 2014 to schedule events throughout Dupont’s centennial year. In 2017, Bob was a central figure in the actual planning of the Borough’s 100th anniversary celebration. Bob is also involved with other local organizations such as Paint Pittston Pink, the Greater Pittston Cultural Coalition, Pittston Arts Council, and NEPA Inclusive. Bob is an accomplished photographer, and he can often be found at these events taking pictures.

It is an honor to recognize Bob Price as he accepts the Person of the Year from the Greater Pittston Sunday Dispatch. I am grateful for all the work he has done on behalf of Dupont Borough and the Greater Pittston area. I wish him all the best and hope that he continues to inspire others with his charitable service to his community.

HONORING PETER MALLON
HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Peter Mallon. Peter is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 374, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout. Peter has been very active with his troop participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Peter has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Peter has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Peter built an eight-foot tall wood fence around three recycling bins at the entrance to Liberty United Methodist Church.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Peter for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAPA VALLEY AGRICULTURAL PRESERVE
HON. MIKE THOMPSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Napa Valley Agricultural Preserve. In 1968, the Napa Board of Supervisors passed a zoning ordinance to preserve open space and prevent future over-development by creating the Napa Valley Agricultural Preserve, the first agricultural preserve in the United States. The ordinance established agriculture and open space as the best use of the land in the valley and foothill areas of Napa County.

Originally the ordinance protected 26,000 acres of land and today the preserve includes...
31,609 acres. The Napa Valley Agricultural Preserve has been a vital component to the health of Californian agriculture and has lead the way in agricultural protection and preservation in California for the past half century. As we continue our efforts to preserve the Napa Valley, property owners have voluntarily placed their land into conservation easements to ensure the acreage remains rural through the preserve.

The ordinance was written to monitor development and ensure that the natural landscape would be protected and that the environment would be utilized in a mutually beneficial way for residents, farmers and developers. The protection from rapid urbanization has enabled agriculture to flourish in the 21st century and has allowed Napa to remain the premier county for California wine growers.

The preserve has ensured the long-term conservation of Napa County’s agricultural legacy and its future as an essential agricultural region in the United States. Because of the preserve the region will continue to be the ideal location for producing wine grapes and other types of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, Napa Valley Agricultural Preserve is crucial to the preservation of the agricultural output of Napa County and all of Northern California. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor its 50th anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VYETTE D. CLARKE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 2018, I was unavoidably detained and missed recorded votes No. 140 and 141. Had I been present, on Roll Call No. 140, H.R. 146, Eastern Band of Cherokee Historic Lands Acquisition Act, as amended, I would have voted YEA; and on Roll Call No. 141, S. 167, National Memorial to Fallen Educators Act, I would have voted YEA.

John Beattie

Hon. Ed Perlmutter
Of Colorado
In the House of Representatives
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor John Beattie for being selected as the 2017 Man of the Year by the Arvada Chamber of Commerce.

Each year the Arvada Chamber recognizes Arvada’s finest men and women for their involvement and dedication to the community. John’s outstanding community involvement, generosity and overall impact on Arvada is exemplified by the amount of time he has donated to the Arvada Food Bank helping to provide thousands of children, families, individuals, seniors and veterans with fresh food. His spirit of service and dedication to his community makes him a role model in the community and is why he was selected as the 2017 Man of the Year.

Congratulations to John Beattie for this well-deserved award, and I thank him for his contribution to our community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LOTTIE ALBERT

HON. ACEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of my dear friend Lottie Albert. Lottie was born on December 25, 1915 to Eva and Louis Wernick in New York City. Twenty-one years later, Lottie married Sol Albert and the two enjoyed 55 years of marriage, and have two lovely daughters, Harriet and Doreen. Lottie was the loving grandmother to Eric, Glenn, and Lowell, as well as a great-grandmother to Kyle, Samantha, Heather, and Seth.

Lottie was a resident and community leader of Broward County for over 40 years. It has been my honor to see Lottie’s commitment and passion for serving her community. She was an amazing individual, who dedicated herself to helping so many throughout South Florida.

In 1988, she was inducted into the Area Agency on Aging Chamber of Commerce’s Hall of Fame. Additionally, Broward County honored Lottie in 2005 by declaring November 12th as “Lottie Albert Appreciation Day.”

In 2012, Lottie was inducted into the Broward County Women’s Hall of Fame for her work with the Ann Storck Children’s Center, the Elderly Interest Fund’s MEDIVAN Program, and the Alzheimer’s Family Center.

Mr. Speaker, Lottie was an extraordinary friend. She helped me through every stage of my career, never wavering, never faltering. On good days and bad days, I knew Lottie would be there for me as she was for so many of us. Her advice, wisdom, humor, and vast knowledge of life will be sorely missed.

RECOGNIZING THE TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT TEAM AT NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER PANAMA CITY DIVISION

HON. NEAL P. DUNN
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding technical development team at Naval Surface Warfare Center, Panama City Division for winning the Excellence in Technology Transfer Award by the Federal Laboratory Consortium for Technology Transfer (FLC). The team of Dennis Gallagher, William Hughes, Allie Pilcher, Richard Manley, Charles Self, and Brian Wentworth won with their invention, the Combat Diver Navigation Module (CDNM).

Everyday, combat divers risk their lives facing hazardous conditions to protect our country—and they do it all while underwater. The CDNM technology will increase accuracy, safety, and situational awareness for combat divers carrying out dangerous underwater missions. Having the technology to safely carry out these missions is crucial and that is where the technical development team at NSWCPCD comes in.

This team worked together to create a product that will not only allow our combat divers to navigate in zero visibility conditions, it will be used to save lives by other first responders and our allies overseas.

Our nation thanks Dennis, William, Allie, Richard, Charles, and Brian for their creative and innovative thinking—your technology will save lives, and exemplifies the best American inventive spirit.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call votes on Monday, April 16, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call votes 140 and 141.

World Hemophilia Day 2018

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge April 17, 2018 as World Hemophilia
Day. This is a day when the international community comes together to raise awareness about hemophilia and other bleeding disorders. It is a day when we also reaffirm our commitment to the individuals across the globe who are living with this dangerous chronic disease.

Hemophilia is a genetic bleeding disorder that prevents blood from clotting normally, leading to uncontrolled bleeding in different parts of the body. Left untreated, the deep internal bleeding associated with hemophilia can lead to permanent damage of organs and tissues as well as potentially fatal outcomes. Additionally, people with hemophilia are at increased risk of developing heart disease, HIV infection, and kidney bleeding as time passes.

Hemophilia is considered a rare disease, but it impacts 20,000 people in the United States and more than 400,000 people worldwide. There is no cure for hemophilia, and three-fourths of patients have inadequate access to treatment. When treatment is accessible, it is expensive, leading to costs as high as $250,000 per year.

As the founder of the Congressional Rare Disease Caucus, I know that much progress has been made in improving access to research funding for rare diseases like hemophilia. However, there is more that must be done to help those struggling with hemophilia obtain needed therapies. With today’s recognition of World Hemophilia Day, it is my hope that we renew our commitment toward achieving accessible, affordable treatment for the hundreds of thousands of hemophilia patients across the world.

HONORING BOB HURLEY
HON. MIKE THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Bob Hurley upon his retirement from a long and distinguished culinary career in Napa Valley.

Mr. Hurley grew up in San Francisco, California. After graduating from high school in 1972, he purchased a van and traveled around the United States. He worked in hotels and restaurants along the way, his first foray into the restaurant business. He realized his passion for cooking and returned to San Francisco, where he enrolled in the culinary program at City College. Post-graduation, Mr. Hurley spent two years traveling in Europe, India and North Africa learning how food and culture were connected.

Mr. Hurley and his wife Cynthia eventually moved to Napa Valley where he quickly became an essential part of our Yountville community. He opened Hurley’s Restaurant in 2002, which is unquestionably a community staple and favorite spot for locals. Ensuring the restaurant’s success meant his normal workweek was Monday to Saturday, 6 a.m. to 7 or 8 p.m. After announcing his plans to retire and close Hurley’s Restaurant, Mr. Hurley has shown the character we all know him to have. He is working to help members of his team, which he considers to be family, find new jobs.

Mr. Hurley has a deep commitment to our community goes beyond his restaurant. He is the Secretary on the Board of Directors for the Lincoln Theatre at the Yountville Veterans Home. He helped create the annual Veterans Day Celebrity Chefs Luncheon and has been a chef for Hands Across the Valley, a fundraiser to help feed those in need throughout Napa County. He has taught annual etiquette classes at Yountville Elementary School, organized fundraisers for Yountville Little League, and supported numerous programs at Cornerly Ranch. During the October 2017 wildfires Mr. Hurley worked for four consecutive nights cooking for first responders. He brought hundreds of meals from his restaurant to the field where the responders were stationed.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hurley is the kind of citizen we should all strive to be. He is known for making everyone feel important and special. For many years he has provided our community with a welcoming place to gather. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor Bob Hurley here today.

IN RECOGNITION OF RICHARD MONTONI
HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the retirement of Richard Montoni, a New England native and dedicated government contractor with a passion for civic responsibility.

Mr. Montoni is well-regarded by his peers and deeply respected in his field. As the Chief Executive Officer of MAXIMUS, Richard has developed the company into a preeminent government partner by delivering health and human services to different communities around the world. Prior to becoming CEO he served as the company’s Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer.

Since 2006, Richard has honed the vision of his company by resolving legal matters and fostering a culture that drives business growth and optimization. In October 2013 Bloomberg named Richard 3rd in their list of Tech’s Top 20 Tumouround Artists.

Richard has remained steadfast in his commitment to communities, teamwork, and strong leadership over the course of his time at the company, only furthering the blossoming relationship between governments and private-sector tech companies that distribute health and human services programs across the globe.

Complementing his work with communities around the world, Richard serves as Vice Chairman for the Northern Virginia Technology Council and Vice Chairman of the Corporate Fund Board of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Richard Montoni and his commitment to providing invaluable health and human services. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing his hard work and dedication as he celebrates his retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 70TH INDEPENDENCE DAY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL
HON. CHRIS COLLINS OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 70th Anniversary of the founding of the Jewish state of Israel. In May of 1948, after centuries of foreign rule, persecution, and conflict, David Ben-Gurion declared the establishment of the state of Israel, which President Harry S. Truman also recognized on the same day.

While the state of Israel has faced much conflict since its founding, and violence between Israelis and Palestinians is common, the resilience and strength of the state and its people is astounding. The founding is a direct result of the hard work and perseverance of the Jewish people, who fought for their rights in the face of persecution. This passion and determination is why we are here today, celebrating the 70th Anniversary of the state of Israel.

The people of Israel plan to celebrate the anniversary with a “70 hours of Israel Celebration” ceremony, bringing together both the citizens of Israel as well as Jewish people all around the world. The theme of this celebration is “Heritage of Innovation”, which highlights the success of the state at spearheading new technology in the fields of medicine and agriculture. I congratulate Israel on its 70th Independence Day, and wish them many more years of prosperity.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. MIKE JOHNSON OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on H.R. 4790 because I was in Louisiana attending a family event.
Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 139.

HONORING IMPACT100 WESTCHESTER

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Impact100 Westchester, an international nonprofit women’s collective giving organization, on their successful fifth grant cycle, as they have broken an amazing milestone by providing more than one million dollars in grant money to other nonprofits across Westchester County.

Impact100 Westchester was established in 2014 with 132 women joining in its first year, and has nearly tripled since its founding. The group is entirely volunteer, run by dedicated constituents striving to make a difference throughout Westchester County. Local organizations who have benefitted from Impact100’s grant giving range from those dealing with children’s mental health, access to education programs, environmental improvements, work training for the impaired, immigration groups, and support for survivors of abuse.

In addition to their philanthropy, Impact100 hosts their own volunteer events across Westchester, continuing to support other nonprofits with their Hands on Impact, with the Day of Service and with educational events which benefit and give back to their community.

During their short tenure, Impact100 Westchester’s success has been reliant on its memberships, volunteers, leadership, advisory council and relationship with the community. I am honored to have Impact100 Westchester in my district, and to recognize them on this wonderful occasion of their Fifth Anniversary. Congratulations to everyone involved with Impact100 Westchester, and thank you to all the caring members who have collectively granted over one million dollars to support and better our community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LOCAL TASK FORCES ON 21ST CENTURY POLICING ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Local Task Forces on 21st Century Policing Act, to assist localities in carrying out the recommendations of the federal Task Force on 21st Century Policing and the Department of Justice’s Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, both of which have detailed the need to strengthen relations between local communities and local law enforcement. The bill would provide grants to local governments to create local task forces on 21st century policing to bring police, representatives of the community and public officials together to develop best policing practices for local police and other ways to strengthen relations between the community and police departments. No new funds are needed.

The task forces, modeled after the federal Task Force on 21st Century Policing, would allow local communities to identify the best ways to create an effective partnership between local law enforcement and the communities they serve, while reducing crime, increasing trust and combating racial profiling.

The task forces could create a partnership to implement practical policing practices acceptable to all concerned.

The creation of task forces could be an important step toward easing the tensions between local law enforcement and many communities. In addition, the task forces could serve to engage local law enforcement and local stakeholders in a transparent public problem-solving process instead of the current situation that encourages parties to choose sides.

CONGRATULATING GARRY MOORE ON RETIREMENT

HON. CHERI BUSTOS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Garry Moore, who is retiring from 25 News Today. Mr. Moore is a pillar of the Peoria community and will be greatly missed.

Mr. Moore has greatly enriched cultural arts within Peoria through his years of leadership. Mr. Moore first moved to Peoria to attend Bradley University where he earned a Bachelor’s and Master’s Degree in Liberal Studies and Broadcast Production and Management. Since then, he has become an anchor and producer for 25 News Today, which is Central Illinois’ longest running morning news program, in addition to serving as President of the Peoria Local of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists. Furthermore, he has worked to educate our community through his role as an adjunct professor at Illinois State University and by holding drumming classes throughout the area. Mr. Moore has also developed and championed several youth empowerment programs throughout Rockford.

It is because of dedicated leaders such as Mr. Garry Moore that I am especially proud to serve Illinois 17th Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Mr. Garry Moore on his well-earned retirement and thank him for all of his contributions and service to our community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DARRELL FOSTER ALLEMAN

HON. DARIN LAHOOD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor and remember the life of Darrell Foster Alleman. Darrell was born on July 12, 1929, in LaSalle, Illinois and was raised on his family farm in Eden, Illinois. Darrell rented his first farm at 18 years old, following his high school graduation, and worked the land for 70 years until he retired. In 1951 he married Jeanne Lorraine Anderson. Together they had 4 children, Debra Lynn, Kimrey Darrell, Janeen Roxanne, and Scott William.
Active in his community, Darrell served as Pulnam County Republican Party Chairman. He held the position for 29 years where he met Presidents Ford, Reagan and H.W. Bush. Beyond his political activity, Darrell was a leading member of the Granville Rotary Club where he received the club’s prestigious Paul Harris award and maintained perfect attendance up until his passing.

Darrell was an avid baseball fan and worked to share the sport with his family, friends and community as a whole. He built what he called the “Alleman Field of Dreams” on his farm where local children could play and practice. It has since become a community icon where every year for the past 4 years a charity baseball game is held and Field of Dreams the movie is shown and enjoyed by all.

We mourn the passing of this hard working and dedicated family man, farmer and community activist. Please join me in honoring and celebrating this life well lived.

HONORING JACOB ANDREW MAGYAR

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob Magyar. Jacob is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout. Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING MARCELO DREFITAS

HON. SCOTT TAYLOR

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include in the RECORD remarks on behalf of Mr. Defreitas, Brazil native and former mayor of the city of Canoas, nominated Mr. Defreitas as Alcalde, the Spanish term for mayor, in recognition of his contributions to our community.

Mr. Defreitas is from the Southern part of Brazil, Rio Grande do Sul, in the city of Uruguaiana. He grew up on a cattle ranch with his parents, Jurema De La Vega Rodrigues de Freitas and Homero Maydana Rodrigues de Freitas and two older brothers, Homero and Jose Mario.

Mr. Defreitas studied public relations in college in Brazil and began working in his field at the largest publishing company in South America. In 1984, he moved to San Francisco to finish his degree and to learn English. After graduating from the University of San Francisco with a degree in graphic arts, he earned a Bachelor of Fine Arts from the Academy of Art University. In 1988, he joined Primo Angeli Inc., and worked his way up from junior designer to art director.

Mr. Defreitas has served as the President of the Board of Directors for La Luz Center since 2016. He has been instrumental in organizing fundraisers such as “Noche de Moon,” which has furthered the Center’s role in the immigrant community. He has also fundraised and organized committees to support local nonprofits, including the Sonoma Valley Museum of Art, Jack London State Park, Lyon Ranch and Sonoma Valley Fund.

Recently Mr. Defreitas’ service has expanded to include helping victims of the October wildfires. Through his 10 to 12 hour work days at La Luz Center, he helped distribute $1.2 million in disaster unemployment assistance, individual assistance disaster relief funds, rent assistance and other services. This is not out of character for him. As he says, “service is my passion.”

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Defreitas is the hard working leader and dedicated community member we should all strive to be. He has seamlessly blended his professional and personal passions, leaving a legacy of community collaboration. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor Marcelo Defreitas as Sonoma’s 43rd Honorary Alcalde.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The State of Israel was established on May 14, 1948, bringing to life the vision of a Jewish homeland where Jews could live freely and peacefully. Since its establishment, Israel has faced numerous challenges and threats to its existence.

Israel is a model of heroic courage and uplifting faith in the face of stubborn non-cooperation, with financial support from the largest Arab country, and Jordan breaking the circle of enmity. It is ever ready to embrace all its neighbors and particularly the Palestinians in the peace of Shalom and Salam to jointly transform shared pain into wellspring of creative hope for future generations, thus fulfilling the Abrahamic prayer.

In resolving the 150 year old tragic conflict with the Palestinians, Israeli security more than ideology should be paramount, through the two major Israeli enterprise regarded realistic compromise with the recalcitrant Arabs as essential while guarding against untenable messianism.

Adverse demographics still Israel’s major concern is to remain both Jewish and democratic. The Palestinians, who have been abused as pawns by their Arab brethren, need yet be educated by courageous leaders to give up their destructive and improbable dream of replacing Israel, and not be financially rewarded for brutal terrorism which postpones peace. Gaza’s ruling Hamas would do better spending outside funds to help their impoverished people whom they use as human shields, rather than rockets and tunnels aimed at Israel. We recall the disturbing collaboration with Hitler of the Palestinian Grand Mufti Haj Amin al Husseini.

Israel is the only country whose very existence is being questioned, with signs of radicalization in its sizable Arab Israeli community. Terrorizing and nuclear ambitions Iran, which denies the Holocaust, and its Lebanese and Palestinian proxies are near Israel’s borders. The United Nations falsely singles Israel out for constant rebuke while sheltering culprit regimes which violate basic human rights. The United States through its unprovoked support of the failed efforts of Nikki Haley stands tall with Israel, its true ally and trusted friend in the shrinking community of democracies. However, the Iranian Shiite menace to both Israel and the Arab world has opened a venue of opportunity exemplified in Saudi Arabia allowing Air India to use its territory to fly to Tel Aviv, Israel which is also a first for India’s airlines!

President Trump Jerusalem Declaration (what an anniversary gift!) that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel and that it is the legitimate right of Israel to keep it as its capital. PresidentTrump also moves US Embassy to Israel in Jerusalem.

Wherever disaster strikes on the globe, whether man-made or natural, you find Israelis on challenging missions, at times first on the scene. This was showcased last February when Israelis assisted with trauma counselling (sadly Israel is bearing the brunt of the suffering), following the shooting of 17 students at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, and reached for the earthquake hit Papua, New Guinea. A Jewish state is bound to reaffirm the thundering call of its prophets, philosophers and poets, anchored in its 4000 year Declaration of Independence, to establish a model society for all its citizens, narrowing economic and social gaps, rejoining in Jewish religious pluralism, promoting the disadvantaged as well as endangered refugees.

Israel is a model of heroic courage and uplifting faith in the face of stubborn non-cooperation, with financial support from the largest Arab country, and Jordan breaking the circle of enmity. It is ever ready to embrace all its neighbors and particularly the Palestinians in the peace of Shalom and Salam to jointly transform shared pain into wellspring of creative hope for future generations, thus fulfilling the Abrahamic prayer.

In resolving the 150 year old tragic conflict with the Palestinians, Israeli security more than ideology should be paramount, through the two major Israeli enterprise regarded realistic compromise with the recalcitrant Arabs as essential while guarding against untenable messianism.

Israel is the only country whose very existence is being questioned, with signs of radicalization in its sizable Arab Israeli community. Terrorizing and nuclear ambitions Iran, which denies the Holocaust, and its Lebanese and Palestinian proxies are near Israel’s borders. The United Nations falsely singles Israel out for constant rebuke while sheltering culprit regimes which violate basic human rights. The United States through its unprovoked support of the failed efforts of Nikki Haley stands tall with Israel, its true ally and trusted friend in the shrinking community of democracies. However, the Iranian Shiite menace to both Israel and the Arab world has opened a venue of opportunity exemplified in Saudi Arabia allowing Air India to use its territory to fly to Tel Aviv, Israel which is also a first for India’s airlines!
Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor PICOCYL for being recognized as the 2017 Business Recognition Award winner by the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation (Jeffco EDC).

The Business Recognition Award shows appreciation for a local company who has shown exceptional primary employment, sales and/or capital investments in the last year. PICOCYL designs, develops and manufactures very small compressed gas cylinders for drug delivery systems, self-injection devices, and the delivery of medical gases. Their patented pic-o cylinders feature accurate and consistent gas fill levels, extremely low puncture forces, and precise sealing surfaces. PICOCYL’s proprietary manufacturing systems and processes have earned their position as the sole global provider of such components to the Life Sciences industry.

Congratulations to PICOCYL for this well-deserved award, and I thank them for their contribution to our community. 

RECOGNIZING THE PHILADELPHIA PROGRAM OF VITAS HEALTHCARE VOLUNTEERS

HON. RYAN A. COSTELLO
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize all the volunteers with the Philadelphia Program of VITAS Healthcare, who graciously give their time and talents serving neighbors in need throughout Southeastern Pennsylvania.

VITAS Healthcare has been a pioneer in hospice care since 1978 and has the distinction of being the nation’s largest provider of end-of-life care. The Philadelphia Program of VITAS launched in 1993 and currently operates three in-patient units serving the five-county Philadelphia region.

More than 60 volunteers in the Philadelphia Program serve, Mr. Wilson helping VITAS Healthcare deliver quality care and support to more than 200 hospice patients and their families every day. Volunteers of all ages and from diverse backgrounds carry out a variety of tasks, ranging from running errands and placing reassuring phone calls to spending quality time with hospice patients in their homes, hospitals and skilled nursing facilities.

VITAS will honor these outstanding volunteers during an annual luncheon on April 28, 2018. The event is part of National Volunteer Appreciation Week, which was established in 1973 by President Richard Nixon in 1974 to highlight the invaluable contributions of all volunteers and the incredible difference they make in the lives of those they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in expressing our sincere gratitude to all the volunteers with the Philadelphia Program of VITAS Healthcare for their selfless service to individuals and communities in southeastern Pennsylvania. May their exemplary dedication and generous spirit inspire all to give back to others and strengthen our communities through volunteerism.

TRIBUTE TO A’JA WILSON

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding young lady and great South Carolinian, Ms. A'ja Wilson. Ms. Wilson is a student at the University of South Carolina (USC) in Columbia, South Carolina. USC’s athletic teams are nicknamed the “ Fighting Gamecocks,” and A’ja is a member of the Gamecocks’ women basketball team. During her tenure at USC, A’ja played in 138 games, averaged 17.3 points per game, had 8.7 rebounds and blocked 2.6 shots per game. In 2017, Ms. Wilson led the Gamecocks to their first ever SEC Tournament Championship and was named the Tournament’s Most Outstanding Player.

This year, A’ja was named the Southeastern Conference’s (SEC) Player of the Year for the 3rd consecutive year, and led the Gamecocks to a record 4th straight SEC Tournament Championship. She also became the all-time leading scorer in USC women’s basketball history and was a consensus first-team All-American for the 3rd consecutive season.

A’ja was named 1st team All-SEC all four of her years at USC. She has swept every one of the National Player of the Year awards as the best player in women’s college basketball in 2018. Last week, A’ja capped off her college athletic career by becoming the first player drafted by the Women National Basketball Association (WNBA).

A’ja Wilson was born in Hopkins, South Carolina to Roscoe and Eva Wilson. She graduated from Heathwood Hall Episcopal High School in Columbia and led the school to the state championship as a senior in 2014. Perhaps more important than her statistics, A’ja Wilson has been a leader for her teams—both on and off the court—and in her community.

USC’s President Dr. Harris Pastides, Athletics Director Ray Tanner and Women’s Head Coach Dawn Staley have all praised A’ja as the person as well as A’ja the player. President Pastides recently told The State newspaper, “A’ja is that person who never turned down an autograph, a selfie, a high five . . . A’ja has never said no to anybody, and that is because she loves this community, she loves the fans. Ms. Speaker, I agree with Dr. Pastides, and I hasten to add that the basketball fans and citizens of her hometown and state love her back.”

H.R. 2901, TO MAKE PERMANENT VOLUNTEER INCOME TAX ASSISTANCE MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2901, to make permanent the IRS Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) matching grant program. The Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program assists low-to-moderate income, elderly, disabled, and limited English speaking taxpayers in preparing and filing their federal income tax returns.

Since fiscal year 2008, Congress has used the appropriations process to provide funding for the Community VITA matching grants program for tax return preparation assistance. But Congress has not authorized the VITA program to receive grants through the tax-writing appropriations process.

This bill puts the VITA grant program on more solid, permanent, and predictable footing.
Without this bill, the IRS has administered the VITA grant program narrowly, restricting grantees’ ability to use grant funds to hire experts to train volunteers and perform quality reviews as well as to serve as Certified Acceptance Agents.

This bill will lead to a stronger VITA program that is able to help many more low-income Americans navigate the tax filing process.

I applaud the sponsors of this bill, Representatives CARLOS CURBelo and DANNY DAVIS for working together on this long overdue legislation.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 2901, I urge all my colleagues to vote yes on this sensible bill.

IN MEMORIAM RODNEY LEWIS

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA
OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Rodney Lewis who passed away on April 10, 2018 at the age of 77. Mr. Lewis was an Arizona native and a member of the Gila River Indian Community. He became a trailblazer in water policy, tribal sovereignty, and Indian law. Our state will miss him dearly.

In 1980, Mr. Lewis was the first Native American attorney to appear before the Supreme Court. As the lead attorney for the Gila River community, Mr. Lewis won part of the largest tribal water settlement in U.S. history. He also was the founding chair of Arizona Bar’s Indian Law section. In 2017, he was appointed to the Central Arizona Water Conservation District Board. The board helps to manage the Central Arizona Project, where Mr. Lewis was able to represent tribal interests.

Mr. Lewis served in the United States Army from 1962 to 1965 where he served as a Ranger and achieved the rank of First Lieutenant. He received his bachelor’s of science from Trinity University in 1962, a master’s in history from Arizona State University in 1969, and a law degree from the University of California, Los Angeles in 1972.

Mr. Lewis is survived by his wife, Willardene, daughter Katherine Elizabeth, sons Stephen Roe and John Blaine, and a host of grandchildren. His son, Stephen, currently serves as Governor of the Gila River Indian Community. Please join me in honoring his memory.

HON. MIKE BISHOP
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following Proclamation:

Whereas, the 8th Congressional District of Michigan joins in celebration as we commemorate Wayne Lynn as he is recognized with the Community Service Award by the Greater Lansing Area Club.

Whereas, Mr. Lynn dedicated his career to helping men and women develop themselves and their faith. Mr. Lynn is the Chairman of the Deacon’s Ministry at Union Missionary Church where he teaches a Men’s Bible Study. He also serves as the Chairman of the Board of Directors for the Turning Point of Lansing where he leads a mentoring program for the growth of young men into adults. He has shared his knowledge and passion with those around him and dedicated himself to the ideals that advance our community.

Let it be known, that the Member of the United States Congress, the Honorable Michael D. Bishop of the 8th Congressional District of Michigan, hereby recognizes Wayne Lynn for his outstanding achievements. Therefore, this document is signed and dedicated to honor this milestone. May others know of my warmest wishes and continued support in the future.

THE PILATUS GROUP

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Pilatus Group for being recognized as the 2017 Business Recognition Award winner by the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation (Jeffco EDC). The Business Recognition Award shows appreciation for a local company who has shown exceptional growth in primary employment, sales income, capital investment, and importance to the region. Founded in 1939 and headquartered in Stans, Switzerland, The Pilatus Group is a leader in the world’s aviation industry and known for its legendary aircraft. The company’s North American operations were established in Jefferson County in 1986 at the Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport and is responsible for PC-12 and PC-24 marketing, sales and servicing activities across North and South America. About 70 percent of all PC-12s that come off the production line in Switzerland are finished to customer specifications at its Jefferson County-based facility. Today, the company employs over 1,900 people worldwide.

Congratulations to The Pilatus Group for this well-deserved award, and I thank them for their contribution to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF BRAMBLETON MIDDLE SCHOOL’S INAUGURAL YEAR

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brambleton Middle School in Ashburn, Virginia as they celebrate their inaugural year with a Day on Capitol Hill.

Since its opening in August 2017, Principal Renee Dawson and the entire faculty and staff have worked tirelessly to ensure the high quality of education to students from every background and creed.

Brambleton Middle School upholds the mission to empower all students to make meaningful contributions to the world. Built on the acronym, C.L.I.M.B., Brambleton faculty and staff work to Create, Lead, Inspire, Motivate, and Believe in the power of diversity to foster a community of excellence. In thanks to this dedicated faculty and staff, Brambleton Middle School students are achieving remarkable things in the classroom while also expanding their horizons through extracurricular activities including VEX robotics and the Civil War History Book club. The Eighth Grade recently organized a kindness brigade, putting out Random Acts of Kindness Magnets around the school. Coming from a family of educators, I understand the impact that teachers and other school staff can have on our children. With that in mind, I am proud of the faculty and staff at Brambleton Middle School who foster personal and educational growth through their approachable and collaborative methodology inside and out of the classroom. Principal Dawson has been passionate about building a cohesive path for her students with the philosophy that it takes a community to raise children, and together as a school, we will be that positive impact in our community. Before the first day of school, Principal Dawson invited all sixth-graders to write her a letter asking for feedback on their individual learning experiences. From this letter-writing campaign, Principal Dawson and the Brambleton Middle School community formed the BAM Ambassadors, a group of 30 kids selected to serve the community as school leaders. By soliciting suggestions and forming the BAM Ambassadors, Principal Dawson and the Brambleton Middle School leadership team set a foundation for the school as it continues to grow.

The hard work these students put towards their academics and their unwavering commitment to civic engagement is inspiring. I hope their curiosity and tenacity persists in future endeavors, and they continue to make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Brambleton Middle School’s inaugural year, and I wish each student many more successes as they continue their education.

RECOGNIZING BAY COUNTY SHERIFF TOMMY FORD

HON. NEAL P. DUNN
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bay County Sheriff Tommy Ford for being appointed by Governor Rick Scott to the Florida Criminal Justice Standards and Training Commission. Tommy started his law enforcement career working for this commission and has now risen to the pinnacle of his profession. Sheriff Ford’s leadership in Bay County has not gone unnoticed.

Sheriff Ford joins law enforcement leaders from across Florida to establish state-wide law enforcement standards and training programs...
that certify officers are prepared to carry out their duties. Sheriff Ford is a native of Northwest Florida, and has honorably served Bay County as a law enforcement officer for over 25 years. He was elected Sheriff of Bay County in 2016.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Bay County Sheriff Tommy Ford for his appointment to this commission and thanking him for his record of exemplary service protecting Northwest Florida.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF DOWNTOWN HOWELL, MICHIGAN

HON. MIKE BISHOP
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to honor a small town in my district which was recently named a recipient of the 2018 Great American Main Street Award. Over the last two decades, downtown Howell, Michigan has completely transformed from a community threatened by Michigan's economic downturn to one that is thriving and charging ahead into the future. With its historical charm and beautiful architecture, downtown Howell is full of local art galleries and quaint parks.

Chosen by a national jury of community development professionals, the Great American Main Street award recognizes communities whose success stories serve as a model for preservation-based commercial revitalization. As a small town that is doing big things, Downtown Howell is setting itself apart as a great place for businesses, families, and everything in between. Great things are happening in the Comeback State, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to what's to come.

GINA RIVAS
HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to recognize and honor Gina Rivas for receiving the 2017 Image Award from the Arvada Chamber of Commerce.

Each year the Arvada Chamber recognizes Arvada’s finest men and women for their involvement and dedication to the community. As the principal of Arvada High School, Gina has gone above and beyond to portray a positive, kind and community-minded image in Arvada. Every day she works to change the story of Arvada High School and improve the outcomes for her students, which ensures a bright future for our families and our community.

Congratulations to Gina Rivas for this well-deserved award, and I thank her for her contribution to our community.

COMMEMORATING PFC LEO J. POWERS AND 2LT ROBERT CRAIG

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to recognize two Medal of Honor recipients, PFC Leo J. Powers and 2LT Robert Craig, who will be included on the Ft. Wolters Medal of Honor Memorial in Mineral Wells, Texas on April 28, 2018.

Established in 2013, the Medal of Honor Memorial lies at the heart of the quiet Ft. Wolters Historical park. This memorial features stone columns currently features the names of sixteen Medal of Honor recipients who trained at Ft. Wolters inscribed upon them. These inscriptions share the stories of these heroes and the gallant actions they took to earn this honor. Later this month, two more individuals will be inscribed on this memorial, PFC Leo J Powers and 2LT Robert Craig.

On February 3, 1944, PFC Leo was serving in the 133rd Infantry Regiment, 34th Infantry Division, who were heavily engaged with Axis Forces in the Battle of Monte Cassino. PFC Powers’ company was assigned to seize the heavily defended Hill 175. The Germans suppressed Power’s and his fellow soldiers by firing mortars and heavy machine gun fire. Unable to advance and casualties mounting, Powers crawled towards the enemy stronghold and destroyed them using hand grenades. After destroying the last of these posts, Powers took the surrender of four wounded Germans while unarmed. Almost a year later, President Franklin D Roosevelt awarded Powers with the Medal of Honor on January 10, 1945.

Born in Scotland in 1919, Robert Craig emigrated with his family to Toledo Ohio. In 1941, Craig enlisted in the Army before World War II and becoming a citizen. By 1943, Craig commissioned as an officer and was a Second Lieutenant with the 15th Infantry Regiment, part of the 3rd Infantry Division. In the early morning of July 10, 1943, 2LT Craig stormed ashore with his unit in the Licata area on the Gulf of Gela during the Invasion of Sicily. Over the next twenty-four hours, an enemy machine gun wounded multiple officers in Craig’s unit. He volunteered to find and destroy it. Shortly after, the platoon he led was counter-attacked by an enemy force that was three times larger. He used himself as a diversion to allow his men to reach cover along a hillcrest. 2LT Craig’s heroic actions and self-sacrifice inspired his men and rallied them to defeat the superior force. 2LT Craig was posthumously awarded our nation’s highest honor on May 26, 1944.

We are blessed to live in a country with individuals like the ones honored at Ft. Wolters. Their actions embody our nation’s greatest ideals. They proceeded without hesitation to put their country’s needs, and more importantly, the lives of the men around them, before their own. Their stories of honor and sacrifice represent an important part of our nation’s history.

It is with great pleasure and honor that I am able to share PFC Leo J. Powers and 2LT Robert Craig story with all of my colleagues in the House.

HONORING NORMA FULINARA PLACIDO

HON. MIKE THOMPSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to honor Norma Fulinara Placido as she retires from 20 years of service as the President of the Filipino Community of Solano County.

Ms. Placido was born in San Felipe, Zambales, Philippines. She graduated with a Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education from Philippine Christian University and taught at an elementary school in her hometown until she immigrated to the United States in 1971. There she joined her husband, Leonardo Placido, who was serving in the U.S. Navy. While her husband was stationed in San Francisco, California, Ms. Placido returned to school at Peralta College where she studied data processing. They later moved to Solano County where they raised their three daughters, Norielyn, Arlene, and Lena.

During her 20 year tenure as President of the Filipino Community of Solano County, Ms. Placido helped raise over $170,000 to provide scholarships for Filipino-American students pursuing higher education. She also spearheaded major renovations of the Filipino Community Center. She oversaw and fundraised for the remodel of the original center and eventually the purchase of a newer and bigger building that was better equipped to meet the needs of the Filipino community. Finally, under Ms. Placido’s stewardship, the Filipino Community of Solano County contributed eyeglasses, books, and much needed funds to the survivors of devastating natural disasters in the Philippines. Ms. Placido has led the organization with continued strength, humility, and fortitude. She has been a great asset to the lives of all Filipino-Americans in our community.

Ms. Placido also mentors other Filipino-Americans in our community, with an aim to nurture their talents. Additionally, she promotes political empowerment and has helped Filipinos seeking public office, assisting mayoral and city council candidates in Vallejo as their campaign manager.

Mr. Speaker, Norma Fulinara Placido deserves to be recognized today for her leadership and commitment to the Filipino Community of Solano County. I am proud to have such a motivated and charitable person living and working in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor her here today.

THE B IN BUSH, RAISING THE BAR—IN HONOR OF FIRST LADY BARBARA BUSH

HON. PETE SESSIONS
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I arise today in honor of one of truly great First Ladies in our Nation’s history, Barbara Bush. As great as a First Lady she was, it pales in comparison to the kind of Mother, Wife, matriarch, and Grandmother she is. A great role model for all
TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF CORDELL HENDERSON

HON. MIKE BISHOP
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following Proclamation:

Whereas, the 8th Congressional District of Michigan joins in celebration as we commemorate Cordell Henderson as he is recognized with the Frederick Douglass Award by the Greater Lansing Area Club.

Whereas, Mr. Henderson dedicated his career to helping both children and adults further their education for 45 years. Serving as a school principal, director of education, counselor and on multiple school boards and committees, he changed and bettered the lives of countless members of our community over the course of his life. He has shared his knowledge and passion with those around him and dedicated himself to the ideals that advance our community.

Let it be known, that the Member of the United States Congress, the Honorable Michael D. Bishop of the 8th Congressional District of the State of Michigan, hereby recognizes Cordell Henderson for his outstanding achievements. Therefore, this document is signed and dedicated to honor this milestone.

HON. RICHARD HUDSON
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN RECOGNITION OF THE VALUE OF THE U.S.-GUATEMALA RELATIONSHIP

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I had a productive and informative meeting last Friday, April 13, with Manuel Espina, Guatemala’s Ambassador to the United States. We discussed the strong economic relationship between our two countries and our cooperative efforts to address drug trafficking and terrorism. I was particularly pleased to learn that Guatemala has...
taken strong efforts on border security, including by detaining 44 individuals with possible ties to ISIS who were traveling with false documents with the intention of using Guatemala as a transit point to reach the United States. I look forward to continuing working with my Guatemalan colleagues to strengthen the relationship between our two countries.

GIRLS OF STEEL

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Girls of Steel robotics team on winning the Chairman’s Award at the March 2018 Greater Pittsburgh Regional FIRST Robotics Competition in California, Pennsylvania.

This prestigious award honors the team that best represents a model for other teams to emulate—and best embodies the purpose and goals of FIRST. This award qualifies them to attend Championships that will be held in Detroit, Michigan, at the end of April 2018.

FIRST, which stands for “For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology,” is an organization dedicated to engaging our students in STEM fields. Hundreds of thousands of students gain practical, team-based engineering experiences through FIRST every year.

As a founder and co-chair of the Congressional Robotics Caucus, I believe competitions like these are incredible tools for helping our young people to explore potential careers in STEM. I’ve witnessed firsthand the incredible economic growth and development that these fields can bring in my home district, and I strongly believe that these fields are crucial to our nation’s future prosperity. I want to commend our students for their hard work and commitment to each other and to their team, and the thousands of hours they have spent collectively doing outreach in the community.

Seventy-one young women from 8th through 12th grades associated with schools located in and around the Pittsburgh area represent this year’s Girls of Steel program, and in recognition of their hard work, intelligence, and teamwork, I would like to mention each of these inspiring young ladies by name. They are Alexandria Adams, Aeryn Anderson, Meghna Behari, Emilia Bianchini, Emma Burnett, Grace Cain, Rosy Chen, Suan Cho, Maria Chutko, Maya Cranor, Claire Cummings, Maansan Dasari, Riley Doyle, Anna Fedele, Rozie Fero, Isabella Florian, Alexandria George, Teadora Gildengers, Corinne Hartman, Sofia Heller, Kristina Hilko, Maia Hochheiser, Anna Jablonowski, Caroline Kenney, Janise Kim, Isabelle Kowenhoven, Mary Laird, Alice Liu, Sally Liu, Eve Mango, Svea McCann, Delaynie McMillan, Sree Mekala, Lauren Michaels, Conner Mekurck, Anna Nesbitt, Anne Karlin Northam, Jimin Oh, Helen Paulina, Leihka Pendyala, Emma Prokop, Grace Raida, Lauren Raida, Ananya Rao, Priya Ray, Sedona Rocher, Rachel Sadeh, Brittany Sadej, Lauren Scheller-Wolf, Sarah Seay, Alexa Selwood, Swathi Senthil, Kriti Shah, Vivian Shao, Lauren Shovlin, Makayla Shreve, Isha Sinha, Amari Smith, Imani Smith, Kayva Soman, Aditi Srivastava, Anna Staresinic, Aditi Thakur, Mikayla Trest, Langley Turcsanyi, Anja Vojt, Janet Wang, Allexandra Westray, Rebecca Wettergreen, Ziya Xu, and Julia Young.

Additionally, I want to commend the faculty and staff of Carnegie Mellon University’s Field Robotics Center, who have mentored the Girls of Steel since 2010. As a result of their efforts, more young women experience real-world technological challenges and learn from some of the nation’s best at solving these problems. These experiences will certainly benefit these young women in the future.

I look forward to hearing about their progress as they advance to the FIRST District Championship in Detroit—one of the largest competitions of its kind. It’s the equivalent of the Super Bowl for robotics. This will be their eighth consecutive trip in eight years and they will be competing against top teams from all over the world.

I want to congratulate the Girls of Steel on their accomplishments. I wish them the best of luck in the upcoming robotics competition as well as continued success in their future academic and professional endeavors.

HONORING MRS. DONNA BRITT

HON. GARRETT GRAVES OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Donna Britt, a beloved community leader and longtime local television personality well known throughout my hometown of Baton Rouge, Louisiana and the surrounding area. Mrs. Britt will be recognized with the prestigious 12 Points Award at a Boy Scouts ceremony this month—a reward reserved for high caliber leaders whose lives embody the 12 traits that the program seeks to instill in its participants: trustworthiness, loyalty, helpfulness, friendliness, courteousness, kindness, obedience, cheerfulness, thriftiness, bravery, cleanliness and reverence. You’d be hard pressed, Mr. Speaker, to find a more fitting recipient than Donna, who has been a shining example of these values through her professional and personal life. An accomplished woman in media, Donna is a Public Relations Association of Louisiana Communicator of the Year and a recipient of the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Louisiana Association of Broadcasters, the Award of Excellence from Women in Media and the Volunteer Activist Award from the Emerge Center. She is also a breast cancer survivor currently battling a recent ALS diagnosis. Despite these medical challenges, Donna’s resilience and warmth are unwavering—a mentality perhaps best revealed through her own personal mantra: “meet each new challenge and master it.” Reflecting on her life and career in a recent interview, she remarked, “I’ve been very blessed, and challenges remind us what is important in life.” Well, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of countless people across South Louisiana who have been blessed by Donna Britt, I’d like to point out that her example helps remind all of us about what is important in life. Congratulations, Donna, on this well-deserved award.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SALUD O. CARBAJAL OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 2018, I missed votes in the House in order to attend funeral services for my late brother. Had I been present, I would have voted: AYE on Roll Call No. 140—the Eastern Band of Cherokee Historic Lands Reacquisition Act, H.R. 146; and AYE on Roll Call No. 141—the National Memorial to Fallen Educators Act, S. 167.

IN HONOR OF PETER AND JOANNE LINDAHL’S 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. LIZ CHENEY OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Peter and Joanne Lindahl on the celebration of their 50th Wedding Anniversary. This significant milestone is a symbol of their commitment to each other and to their family. I am happy to join their friends and family in extending my best to them on this special occasion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Peter and Joanne on
the celebration of their 50th Wedding Anniversary. I wish them the best today and for many more blessed years to come.

HONORING JACKSON SCOTT GARRETT
HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018
Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jackson Garrett. Jackson is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jackson has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jackson has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jackson has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending people for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

STEM PROGRAM AT WHEAT RIDGE HIGH SCHOOL
HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018
Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the STEM Program at Wheat Ridge High School for being recognized as the 2017 Horizon Award winner by the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation (Jeffco EDC).

The Horizon Award recognizes an organization or program that is a rising star in the community and will contribute to the future economic vitality of Jefferson County. Established in 2014, Wheat Ridge High School’s STEM Program focuses on taking science, technology, engineering & math taught in class and using it in a real-world application through the building of concept vehicles. Since it was created, it has expanded to 80 students. The cost to run the STEM program is approximately $50,000 per year and 80 percent of these funds are raised by the students themselves, expanding their learning opportunity into fundraising and finance. Participating students are responsible for all their own fundraising, marketing, social media and videography. The Wheat Ridge High School STEM Program gives students real world experience from concept to implementation and everything in between.

Congratulations to the STEM Program at Wheat Ridge High School for this well-deserved award, and I thank them for their contribution to our community.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THERESA RANDLEMAN
HON. MIKE BISHOP
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018
Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I include in the record the following Proclamation:

Whereas, the 8th Congressional District of Michigan joins in celebration as we commemorate Theresa Randleman, as she is recognized with the Business Excellence Award by the Greater Lansing Area Club.

Whereas, Ms. Randleman has dedicated her career to speaking on behalf of women and female youth with an emphasis on producing, hosting, and sponsoring female empowerment programs. Her work ranges from international speaking which empowers women across the globe, to hosting local Expos which guide aspiring female entrepreneurs on the path to success. She has shared her knowledge and passion all around the world and dedicated herself to the ideals that advance our community.

Let it be known, that the Member of the United States Congress, the Honorable MICHAELO D. BISHOP of the 8th Congressional District of the State of Michigan, hereby recognizes Theresa Randleman for her outstanding achievements. Therefore, this document is signed and dedicated to honor this milestone. May others know of my warmest wishes and signed and dedicated to honor this milestone.

TRUMP REPUBLICANS ARE WAGING WAR ON THE WORKING POOR
HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 2018
Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to Executive Order 13828, entitled “Reducing Poverty in America by Promoting Opportunity and Economic Mobility,” issued by the President last Tuesday, April 10, 2018.

The President would have the American people believe he is bringing the country together and growing the economy for all Americans. Nothing could be further from the truth. Executive Order 13828 is a thinly-veiled attempt to restrict access to health care, housing, food, and many other basic living programs by adding onerous work requirements.

These social safety net programs provide necessary government assistance to help Americans families maintain a basic standard of living, and are a safety net for the poorest of the poor. Millions of Americans, despite working two jobs, depend on these programs just to keep food on the table and a roof over their heads for their families.

In addition, the vast majority of full-time workers live paycheck to paycheck. In fact, 70 percent of Americans rely on at least one means tested federal program throughout their lives.

America, one of the richest countries in the world, should be able to help families caught in, to use the celebrated LBJ biographer Robert Caro’s famous phrase, the “tentacles of circumstance.”

However, we have a president who is insensitive to the plights of every day Americans. Trump and the conservative acolytes who seek to implement his agenda paint an inaccurate portrayal of poor people as lazy “Welfare Queens” who would rather depend on the government than pull themselves up by their bootstraps, but nothing could be further from the truth.

The President should know that it is unreasonable to expect the poorest people to pull themselves up by their bootstraps when they do not have boots.

Our nation’s social safety net programs already fail to help all of the families in need: Only 1 in 4 poor families with children receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF); SNAP only provide $1.40 per meal; and Housing assistance reaches just 1 in 5 eligible families.

That is because the federal government has failed to raise the minimum wage in almost a decade, so even if you work a full-time minimum wage job, you are still living in poverty. Members of the CBC are here to tell the American people, do not be fooled. Donald Trump says this is about a “poverty trap,” but the real trap is not raising the minimum wage.

The President opposes increasing the minimum wage and eliminating labor protections for middle and lower income and lower income workers in the African American community. Mr. Speaker, raising the minimum wage to just $12 per hour would save $53 billion in SNAP benefits alone.

Wage gaps between are larger today than they were in 1979.

For example, African American men’s average hourly wages were 22.2 percent lower than those of white men in 1979 and declined to 31.0 percent lower by 2015.

Young African American women have been hardest hit since 2000.

The racial wealth gap is much larger than the wage or income gap by race.

Average wealth for white families is ten times higher than average wealth for African American families.

Worse still, median white wealth (wealth for the family in the exact middle of the overall distribution—wealthier than half of all families and less-wealthy than half) is twelve times higher than median African American wealth.

Wage gaps are growing primarily because of discrimination and racial differences in skills and worker characteristics.

Declining unionization has also had a role in the growing black-white wage gap, particularly for men newly joining the workforce.

African Americans have been disproportionately affected by the growing wage gap between pay and productivity.

Not only are the President’s policies divisive along racial and cultural lines, they also serve to further increase economic inequality due to their clear design in favor of the wealthiest among us at the expense of everyone else. Trump’s billionaire tax heist robs the U.S. Treasury of $1.5 trillion in resources that could be invested in economic growth in under-served communities.
The President has proposed doubling down on mass incarceration and the war on drugs, which drains the African American labor pool.

The President has taken every opportunity to harm health care for African-Americans from sabotaging the ACA to ending Medicaid as we know it.

This president is no friend to African Americans, or their pocket books.

Trump also wants you to believe that he wants a bipartisan infrastructure plan. Do not be fooled.

Trump’s review of “welfare programs” is an immoral attempt to gut the programs that provide a basic standard of living for Americans struggling to make ends meet, all to pay for massive tax cuts to himself and the richest 1 percent.

Instead, he should raise wages and invest in job training programs to prepare Americans for the work of the future.

Mr. Speaker, our nation still has a long way to go before we achieve economic equality for all its citizens.

The President and Congressional Republicans should work with Democrats to put more money in the pockets of hardworking Americans.

At the end of the day, our constituents should be able to support their children with one full-time job.

Ultimately, we need to give families the tools they need to rise out of poverty, not undercut programs that keep them afloat.

Honoring the 90th Anniversary of Caltrans Structure Maintenance & Investigations

Hon. Mike Thompson of California

In the House of Representatives

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Office of Structure Maintenance & Investigations upon the occasion of its 90th anniversary since its creation.

The Office of Structure Maintenance & Investigations engineers and structural technicians perform ongoing inspection of more than 24,000 state highway and locally owned bridges within the boundaries of the Golden State. They ensure the safety of the traveling public and to protect the public’s multi-billion dollar investment in its bridge inventory; and since its creation in 1927 California’s bridge inspection unit has completed nearly 770,000 routine bridge inspections, and thousands of special steel, underwater, hydraulic, sign structure and tunnel inspections. The bridge inspection program has become the model for other bridge departments in the United States and around the world.

Structure Maintenance & Investigations, based on the findings of its inspections, has worked with its District Maintenance counterparts to complete hundreds of millions of repairs to ensure the safety and structural integrity of each public agency bridge in California. The dedicated personnel of Structure Maintenance & Investigations has responded over its nine decades of service to every emergency impacting the state’s bridge inventory, including the 1989 Loma Prieta and 2011 Napa earthquakes.

Mr. Speaker, Caltrans Office of Structure Maintenance & Investigations and its employees have kept California’s highways and bridges safe. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor the Office and employees past and present today.

Zimmer Biomet Spine

Hon. Ed Perlmutter of Colorado

In the House of Representatives

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Zimmer Biomet Spine for being recognized as the 2017 Business Recognition Award winner by the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation (Jeffco EDC).

The Business Recognition Award shows appreciation for a local company who has shown exceptional growth in primary employment, sales and/or capital investments in the last year. Zimmer Biomet Spine is a leader in restoring mobility, alleviating pain, and improving the quality of life for patients around the world by delivering surgeons a comprehensive portfolio of quality spine technologies and procedural innovation. It maintains world-class scientific facilities and resources and collaborates with leading clinicians and researchers around the world. Today, it has operations in more than 25 countries and sells products in more than 100 countries.

Congratulations to Zimmer Biomet Spine for this well-deserved award, and I thank them for their contribution to our community.
Tuesday, April 17, 2018
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Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2191–S2226

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2681–2691, and S. Res. 470–472. Page S2218

Measures Passed:

Hack the Department of Homeland Security Act: Senate passed S. 1281, to establish a bug bounty pilot program within the Department of Homeland Security, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S2223–25

McConnell (for Hassan) Amendment No. 2238, of a perfecting nature. Page S2224

Vietnam Veterans Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 471, designating March 29, 2018, as “Vietnam Veterans Day”. Page S2225

Gold Star Wives Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 472, designating April 5, 2018, as “Gold Star Wives Day”. Page S2225

Measures Considered:

Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance With the Equal Credit Opportunity Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of S.J. Res. 57, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act”, after agreeing to the motion to proceed.

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 75), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution. Page S2200

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the joint resolution at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, April 18, 2018, with the time until 12 noon, equally divided between the managers, or their designees; that at 12 noon, Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the vote on themotion to invoke closure with respect to the House message to accompany S. 140, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund, occur following disposition of S.J. Res. 57. Page S2225

Appointments:

Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 70–770, the appointment of the following individual to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: Senator Boozman. Page S2223

Muniz Nomination—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Carlos G. Muniz, of Florida, to be General Counsel, Department of Education.

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, if applicable, at 1 p.m., on Wednesday, April 18, 2018, Senate continue consideration of the nomination, with one hour of debate remaining, equally divided between Senator Gillibrand, or her designee, and Senator Alexander, or his designee, on the nomination; and that following the use or yielding back of that time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination under the previous orders of April 9, 2018 and April 16, 2018. Page S2199

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

David Fabian Black, of North Dakota, to be Deputy Commissioner of Social Security for the term expiring January 19, 2019.

Andrew M. Saul, of New York, to be Commissioner of Social Security for the term expiring January 19, 2019.

Andrew M. Saul, of New York, to be Commissioner of Social Security for the term expiring January 19, 2025.

Alexander Crenshaw, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of three years.
Louis DeJoy, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2020.

Frederick Perpall, of Texas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2020.

Susan M. McCue, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of two years.

Victoria Ann Hughes, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2021.

Heather Reynolds, of Texas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring September 14, 2021.

Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

NOMINATIONS
Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Admiral Philip S. Davidson, USN, for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Commander, United States Pacific Command, and General Terrence J. O’Shaughnessy, USAF, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United States Northern Command, and Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command, both of the Department of Defense, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

NOMINATIONS
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Thelma Drake, of Virginia, to be Federal Transit Administrator, Department of Transportation, Jeffrey Nadaner, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and Seth Daniel Appleton, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATION
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Karl L. Schultz, to be Admiral and to be Commandant of the Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.
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National Park Service Oversight

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine deferred maintenance and operational needs of the National Park Service, after receiving testimony from Lena McDowall, Deputy Director for Management and Administration, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Will Shafroth, National Park Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Marc Berejka, Recreational Equipment, Inc., Kent, Washington; Sarah Leonard, Alaska Travel Industry Association, Anchorage; Shawn Regan, Property and Environment Research Center, Bozeman, Montana; and Richard G. Ring, Coalition to Protect America’s National Parks, Bethesda, Maryland.

U.S. Policy in Yemen

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States policy in Yemen, after receiving testimony from David M. Satterfield, Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs; Robert Karem, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Policy; and Robert Jenkins, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, United States Agency for International Development.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 5526–5544; and 2 resolutions, H.J. Res. 133 and H. Res. 833 were introduced. Pages H3395–96

Additional Cosponsors: Page H3397

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today. Page H3345

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bishop (UT) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H3351

Recess: The House recessed at 10:52 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. Page H3351

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Moving Americans Privacy Protection Act: H.R. 4403, amended, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to protect personally identifiable information; Pages H3359–64

Requiring notice from the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of any closure of a Taxpayer Assistance Center: H.R. 5440, amended, to require notice from the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of any closure of a Taxpayer Assistance Center; Pages H3364–66

Amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restrict the immediate sale of seized property by the Secretary of the Treasury to perishable goods: H.R. 5446, amended, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restrict the immediate sale of seized property by the Secretary of the Treasury to perishable goods; Pages H3366–67

Amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury to provide to taxpayers information regarding low-income taxpayer clinics: H.R. 5438, amended, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury to provide to taxpayers information regarding low-income taxpayer clinics; Pages H3367–68

Requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a program for the issuance of identity protection personal identification numbers: H.R. 5437, amended, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a program for the issuance of identity protection personal identification numbers; Pages H3369–70

Providing for a single point of contact at the Internal Revenue Service for the taxpayers who are victims of tax-related identity theft: H.R. 5439, amended, to provide for a single point of contact at the Internal Revenue Service for the taxpayers who are victims of tax-related identity theft; Pages H3370–71

Amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require electronic filing of the annual returns of exempt organizations and provide for making such returns available for public inspection: H.R. 5443, amended, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require electronic filing of the annual returns of exempt organizations and provide for making such returns available for public inspection; Pages H3371–72

Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Permanence Act: H.R. 2901, amended, to amend the Internal
Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance matching grant program; and

Social Security Child Protection Act of 2018: H.R. 1512, amended, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the reissuance of Social Security account numbers to young children in cases where confidentiality has been compromised.

Pages H3373–75

Protecting Children from Identity Theft Act: The House passed H.R. 5192, to authorize the Commissioner of Social Security to provide confirmation of fraud protection data to certain permitted entities, by a yea-and-nay vote of 420 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 142.

Pages H3375–77

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–68 shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill. Page H3377

H. Res. 830, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5192) was agreed to by voice vote, after the previous question was ordered without objection.

Pages H3353–56

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 833, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Page H3381

Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Con. Res. 115, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition.

Page H3381

Providing for a recess of the House for a joint meeting to receive His Excellency Emmanuel Macron, President of the French Republic: Agreed by unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, April 25, 2018, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Emmanuel Macron, President of the French Republic.

Page H3381

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Justice for Victims of IRS Scams and Identity Theft Act: H.R. 2905, amended, to require the Attorney General to establish procedures for expedited review of the case of any person who unlawfully solicits personal information for purposes of committing identity theft, while purporting to be acting on behalf of the IRS.

Pages H3356–59

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H3356.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on pages H3380–81. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—OFFICE OF PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Office of Public and Indian Housing. Testimony was heard from Dominique Blom, General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. COAST GUARD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a budget hearing on the U.S. Coast Guard. Testimony was heard from Commandant Paul F. Zukunft, U.S. Coast Guard.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Dingell, Hill, and Suozzi.

APPROPRIATIONS—INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Indian Health Service. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Michael D. Weahkee, Acting Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

APPROPRIATIONS—GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a budget hearing on the General Services Administration. Testimony was heard from Emily W. Murphy, Administrator, General Services Administration.
MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND OUTSIDE WITNESSES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing entitled “Members of Congress and Outside Witnesses”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Takano, McGovern, and Hultgren; and public witnesses.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Hill, Moore, and Watson Coleman.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Walz, Tenney, Rutherford, Takano, Hill, and Kuster of New Hampshire.

APPROPRIATIONS—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Food and Drug Administration. Testimony was heard from Scott Gottlieb, M.D., Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration.

PROMOTING DOD’S CULTURE OF INNOVATION

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Promoting DoD’s Culture of Innovation”. Testimony was heard from Michael D. Griffin, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, Department of Defense; and Eric Schmidt, Chairman, Defense Innovation Board, Department of Defense.

FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET REQUEST FOR MISSILE DEFENSE AND MISSILE DEFEAT PROGRAMS


FRAUD, MISMANAGEMENT, NON-COMPLIANCE, AND SAFETY: THE HISTORY OF FAILURES OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Fraud, Mismanagement, Non-Compliance, and Safety: The History of Failures of the Corporation for National and Community Service”. Testimony was heard from Barbara Stewart, Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service.

OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION AND THE FY2019 BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the FY2019 Budget”. Testimony was heard from the following Federal Energy Regulatory Commission officials: Neil Chatterjee, Commissioner; Richard Glick, Commissioner; Cheryl A. LaFleur, Commissioner; Kevin J. McIntyre, Chairman; and Robert F. Powelson, Commissioner.

FROM CORE TO EDGE: PERSPECTIVE ON INTERNET PRIORITIZATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled “From Core to Edge: Perspective on Internet Prioritization”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SEMI-ANNUAL TESTIMONY ON THE FEDERAL RESERVE’S SUPERVISION AND REGULATION OF THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Semi-Annual Testimony on the Federal Reserve’s Supervision and Regulation of the Financial System”. Testimony was heard from Randal Quarles, Vice Chairman for Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM: AN OVERSIGHT AND REVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance held a hearing entitled “Housing Choice Voucher Program: An Oversight and Review of Legislative Proposals”. Testimony was heard from Lynn Kovich, Deputy Secretary, Office of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services, Pennsylvania Department of Human Services; and public witnesses.
MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5040, the “Export Control Reform Act of 2018”; H.R. 5129, the “Global Food Security Reauthorization Act of 2018”; H.R. 5480, the “Women’s and Economic Empowerment Act”; and H.R. 5274, the “Global Electoral Exchange Act”. H.R. 5480, H.R. 5274, H.R. 5129, and H.R. 5040 were ordered reported, as amended.

REINFORCING THE U.S.-TAIWAN RELATIONSHIP

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled “Reinforcing the U.S.-Taiwan Relationship”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM: AN EXAMINATION OF IRAN’S GLOBAL TERRORISM NETWORK

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled “State Sponsors of Terrorism: An Examination of Iran’s Global Terrorism Network”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Federal Bureau of Prisons”. Testimony was heard from Mark Inch, Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons.

SAFEGUARDING TRADE SECRETS IN THE UNITED STATES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled “Safeguarding Trade Secrets in the United States”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans held a hearing on H.R. 4528, to make technical amendments to certain marine fish conservation statutes, and for other purposes; H.R. 5248, the “Sustainable Shark Fisheries and Trade Act”; and H.R. 1456, the “Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act of 2017”. Testimony was heard from Alan Risenhoover, Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

CONTINUED OVERSIGHT OVER THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Oversight and Government Reform; and Subcommittee on Government Operations held a joint hearing entitled “Continued Oversight Over the Internal Revenue Service”. Testimony was heard from J. David Kautter, Acting Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service; J. Russell George, Inspector General, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration; and Nina E. Olson, National Taxpayer Advocate, Internal Revenue Service.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5509, the “Innovations in Mentoring, Training, and Apprenticeships Act”; and H.R. 5503, the “National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2018”. H.R. 5509 and H.R. 5503 were ordered reported, as amended.

SMALL BUSINESS RETIREMENT PLANS AND THE IRS’ EMPLOYEE PLANS FEE CHANGE

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax, and Capital Access held a hearing entitled “Small Business Retirement Plans and the IRS’ Employee Plans Fee Change”. Testimony was heard from Sunita Lough, Project Director, Tax Reform Implementation Office, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.

OVERSIGHT OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Surface Transportation Board Reauthorization Act of 2015”. Testimony was heard from Ann D. Begeman, Chairman, Surface Transportation Board; and Deb Miller, Vice Chairman, Surface Transportation Board.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on H.R. 1506, the “VA Health Care Provider Education Debt Relief Act of 2017”; H.R. 2322, the “Injured and Amputee Veterans Bill of Rights”; H.R. 3832, the “Veterans Opioid Abuse Prevention Act”; H.R. 4334, the “Improving Oversight of Women Veterans’ Care Act of 2017”; H.R. 4635, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to increase the number of peer-to-peer counselors providing counseling for women veterans, and for other purposes; legislation on the VA Medicinal Cannabis Research Act of 2018; and legislation
to make certain improvements in the Family Caregiver Program. Testimony was heard from Representatives O’Rourke, Walberg, Dunn, Correa, and Coffman; and public witnesses.

JOBS AND OPPORTUNITY: FEDERAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE JOBS GAP

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Jobs and Opportunity: Federal Perspectives on the Jobs Gap”. Testimony was heard from R. Alexander Acosta, Secretary, Department of Labor.

Joint Meetings

FEDERAL BUDGET PROCESS

Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform: Committee concluded a hearing to examine opportunities to significantly improve the Federal budget process, after receiving testimony from Douglas Holtz-Eakin, American Action Forum, Washington, D.C.; and Martha B. Coven, Princeton University Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton, New Jersey.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation within the Department of the Interior, 2:30 p.m., SD–430.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2:30 p.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold hearings to examine accelerating new technologies to meet emerging threats, 2:30 p.m., SR–232A.


Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine abusive robocalls and how to stop them, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security, to hold hearings to examine Olympic abuse, focusing on the role of national governing bodies in protecting our athletes, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the appropriate role of states and the Federal government in protecting groundwater, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired, or Otherwise Print Disabled, done at Marrakesh on June 27, 2013 (Marrakesh Treaty) (Treaty Doc.114–06), 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of David Williams, of Illinois, Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, and Calvin R. Tucker, of Pennsylvania, each to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the 30th anniversary of tribal self-governance, focusing on successes in self-governance and an outlook for the next 30 years, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Patent and Trademark Office, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration, to hold hearings to examine strengthening and reforming America’s immigration court system, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: business meeting to consider the nominations of Paul R. Lawrence, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and Joseph L. Falvey, Jr., of Michigan, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, 12 noon, S–216, Capitol.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine exploitation of older Americans by guardians and others they trust, 9:30 a.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Agriculture. Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2, the “Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018”, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, budget hearing entitled “Member Day”, 9 a.m., 2007 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, budget hearing entitled “Member Day”, 1 p.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, budget hearing entitled “Member Day”, 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, budget hearing entitled “Health and Human Services Biodefense Activities”, 10 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, budget hearing on the Office of Management and Budget, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.


Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies,
budget hearing on the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, 1:30 p.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, budget hearing on the Judiciary, 2 p.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Office of Compliance, 2:30 p.m., HT–2 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Congressional Budget Office, 3:30 p.m., HT–2 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Oversight and Reform of the Department of Defense ‘4th Estate’”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2019 Energy, Installations and Environment Budget Request”, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing entitled “Ground Force Modernization Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2019”, 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.


Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S. Policy Toward a Turbulent Middle East”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, hearing entitled “The Dayton Legacy and the Future of Bosnia and the Western Balkans”, 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled “Libya Fractured: The Struggle for Unity”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.


Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 788, the “Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act”; H.R. 1026, the “North Country National Scenic Trail Route Adjustment Act”; H.R. 1037, to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; H.R. 2991, the “Susquehanna National Heritage Area Act”; H.R. 3400, the “Recreation Not Red-Tape Act”; H.R. 4069, to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to clarify the treatment of authentic Alaska Native articles of handicraft containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes; and H.R. 4645, the “East Rosebud Wild and Scenic Rivers Act”, 10:15 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 3846, the “Power Counties Act”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Top Management and Performance Challenges Identified Government-wide by the Inspector General Community”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Information Technology, hearing entitled “Game Changers: Artificial Intelligence Part III, Artificial Intelligence and Public Policy”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled “Composite Materials—Strengthening Infrastructure Development”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “An Examination of the Small Business Administration’s 7(a) Loans to Poultry Farmers”, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans: to hold hearings to examine the history and structure of the multiemployer pension system, 2 p.m., SD–215.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
9:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 18

Senate Chamber
Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of S.J. Res. 57, Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, with a vote on passage of the joint resolution at 12 noon, to be followed by a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to S. 140, Amending The White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act, with further amendment. If cloture is not invoked, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of James Bridenstine, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

At 2 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Carlos G. Muniz, of Florida, to be General Counsel, Department of Education.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Wednesday, April 18

House Chamber
Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 5444—Taxpayer First Act (Subject to a Rule) and H.R. 5445—21st Century IRS Act (Subject to a Rule).
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