United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 2018 *No. 7*

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 11, 2018.

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

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

PRAYER

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

Loving God, Lord of us all, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You, O Lord, are the source of life and love. You hear the prayer of Congress, both for the good of this Nation and for the good of humanity around the world. Help this Congress and the President to discern Your will in our day.

By drawing upon the truth taken from a diversity of opinions, may a solid foundation be formed upon which a stable future may be built.

May short-term gains or self-interest never prove to be an obstacle to true vision. Rather, Lord, grant to each Member depth of perception, clear analysis, and creative response to the needs of our time.

In these days, give wisdom to all the Members, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GALLAGHER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

PARTICIPATING IN MARTIN LUTHER KING DAY OF SERVICE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I will honor Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s legacy by volunteering my time to help my community. I will be at the State College Food Bank working with its clients during distribution time.

State College Food Bank, a wonderful organization under the leadership of the executive director, Carol Pioli, is a tremendously successful organization. Last year, the food bank served thousands of people and more than 700 families in the community. In addition, it shared 26 tons of food to help other nonprofit organizations with their food needs.

As chairman of the Agriculture Committee's Nutrition Subcommittee, I know the vital role the State College Food Bank plays in the lives of so many. Since it opened in 1982, it has provided nutritious food to those in need.

I look forward to working alongside food bank employees and volunteers on Monday because too many Americans are food insecure, and through local food banks, these individuals can receive healthy and nutritious food for themselves and their families. No one in America should go hungry, and our local food banks work every day to realize that goal.

WE NEED TO VOTE ON THE DREAM ACT

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share Fabiola's story and continue to demand a vote on the Dream Act.

Fabiola and her family moved to Oregon when she was just 6 years old. When DACA was announced, it gave her the strength to come out of the shadows and pursue her goals. She earned a driver's license, took out a loan for a car, got a job, and started working towards an associate's degree in early childhood education.

Fabiola currently works as a bilingual preschool teacher for Early Head Start and will soon earn her bachelor's degree in early childhood education, focused on special education, from Western Oregon University.

DACA has given Fabiola the opportunity to make her dream of becoming a special needs teacher a reality. Because leadership in Congress refuses to act on DACA, however, she will lose her status, and Fabiola will not be allowed to maintain her teaching license.

Every day, 122 DACA recipients lose their ability to have a job and go to school. We don't have until March 15. It is happening now.

Stop delaying. It is time to get it done. Let's include a clean Dream Act in next week's funding package.

HONORING THE 2018 NORTH CAROLINA MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and encourage the thousands of great, noble North Carolinians participating in the 2018 March for Life this weekend.

We know from God's Word, the Holy Scriptures, that life begins at conception. Unfortunately, since the Supreme Court decision of Roe v. Wade, more than 59 million innocent lives have been terminated through abortion. That is almost six times the population of North Carolina.

Without question, it is our moral obligation to fight for and protect the lives of those who cannot speak for themselves, the talented and able lives of those who are no different than our own.

Today and every day, I am honored to stand with those who so bravely fight to protect the most vulnerable among us. With each passing day, we shall continue to advance this very noble cause.

FOR DREAMERS, THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, every day, 122 DREAMers lose their protections from deportation. Every day, 122 young people in this country still consider whether they should go to class, whether they should show up for work, whether they should put on the uniform of our military in service to our country, because every day that Congress delays and does nothing means more bright, hardworking young people who know no other home than the United States are being asked to leave or risk being arrested.

Our inaction is creating an impending crisis for workforces, families, and communities around the country. We must pass a permanent, bipartisan solution to enable DREAMers to continue to live, work, and contribute to this country and that provides a pathway to full citizenship.

We have seen time and time again that the overwhelming majority of Americans on both sides of the aisle in both parties agree that we should protect our DREAMers. Yesterday, 115 business leaders, including CEOs from Amazon, Facebook, General Motors, and Verizon, asked Congress to act immediately.

DREAMers don't have the luxury of time. Hundreds of thousands of deserving young people are counting on us. We can't wait until March to make sure that our DREAMers are protected and included and welcomed.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now.

DO YOUR JOB

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I don't often make these 1-minute speeches, but I am concerned about where we might we headed next week in terms of the budget.

Last week, the House took another weeklong break instead of staying here in order to talk about fulfilling our fundamental duty of passing a budget and funding the government. Yet here we are once again, for the third time in 2 months, just 10 days away from government funding running out, and once again we are scheduled to leave town.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is paid to do a job, and so we shouldn't leave town until that job is done. This constant cycle of careening from one budgetary deadline to the next is irresponsible and embarrassing. Only in Washington is doing a basic task like keeping the lights on considered such a difficult achievement.

It doesn't have to be this way. The solution is simple: No more breaks. Lock us on the House floor until we reach a budget deal that does right by our constituents, does right by the military, does right by all these different programs.

Passing a budget is not just our job, it is the law, and no one, including this body, is above the law. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to end the partisan stall tactics. Let's work together and do the job we were elected to do.

THE BLANK CHECK OF SECTION 702

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, since 2001, the civil liberties of the American people have been trampled on under the blank check of section 702, a program that exists to allow our government to surveil foreigners on foreign soil, but which also allows our government to collect, retain, and search communications of everyday Americans without a warrant and with blatant disregard for our Fourth Amendment constitutional rights.

Now, we have a very important responsibility here in Congress to strike a balance between national security and keeping the American people safe while also protecting our constitutionally protected freedoms.

I urge my colleagues to vote for our bipartisan USA Rights amendment today, which maintains necessary authorities to keep the American people safe while also, simultaneously, protecting our civil liberties.

Now, unfortunately, opponents of this USA Rights amendment are pushing fear tactics and misinformation. Don't fall for it. Let us make this critical choice. Vote to keep our country safe. Vote to uphold our constitutional rights that so many have fought and died to protect.

RECOGNIZING TANIA PRATNICKI YOUNG

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent a large number of dedicated autoworkers who live and work in Michigan's Seventh Congressional District. Today I want to recognize one of the truly exceptional ones, Tania Pratnicki Young, the plant manager at Dundee Engine Plant in Dundee, Michigan. Tania has been the plant manager since 2013 and recently reached a remarkable milestone: 40 years with the company.

The Fiat Chrysler plant employs about 700 people and produces engines for various Dodge and Jeep products, including the Jeep Cherokee. Under Tania's leadership, Dundee was the first U.S. facility to be awarded silver status for implementing the principles of World Class Manufacturing. It shows her commitment to excellence in productivity, quality, and safety.

Tania calls Dundee ''the family plant.'' I have had the privilege of touring the factory floor with her and was impressed by the efficiency of the plant and the friendliness of her team. Thanks to people like Tania Pratnicki Young, the auto industry is thriving in Michigan.

Tania, congratulations on your 40-year anniversary.

HONORING DANA MARSHALL-BERNSTEIN

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

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today not only to mourn the loss of a family friend and lifelong Las Vegas resident, but to let Congress know what an amazing young woman she was.

Dana Marshall-Bernstein died in December at the age of 28 following a lifelong battle with Crohn's disease. She spent most of her life in and out of the hospital, but even while she was undergoing countless surgeries, she never let her disease define her. She never stopped feeling optimistic about her future. She believed in kindness, and she used her experience to comfort others who were also affected by Crohn's disease.

She shined in more ways than one, and I know she will continue to shine in the memory of each and every life she touched, and her memory will be a blessing to all those who knew and loved her.

I encourage all Members here today to carry with them the courage and determination that Dana brought into this world: to always think and live life with positivity and never ever stop believing in doing good by others.

NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS DAY

(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, as a judge in Texas, I saw it all: rape, robbery, murder, kidnapping, child abuse. Now, in Congress, we are learning about the horrors of human trafficking, sex slavery.

Many groundbreaking laws have been passed to increase resources for victims and crack down on traffickers and buyers, but like all criminal enterprises, traffickers constantly stay ahead of the law.

Fortunately for victims, there is an army of individuals, NGOs, religious and other advocacy groups fighting on behalf of victims. The people serving in these organizations are New Friends New Life, RAIN, Polaris, Rights4Girls, Shared Hope, Coalition Against Trafficking, and Demand Abolition, just to name a few. They have all dedicated their lives to serve and save victims of trafficking on the front lines.

On this National Human Trafficking Awareness Day, I want to thank all those warriors—the victims' posse, as I call them—battling the injustice of human slavery. We will not give up this fight until this scourge has been eradicated.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 0915

COMMEMORATING KOREAN AMERICAN DAY

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate Korean American Day, which celebrates the arrival of the first 102 Korean immigrants to the United States on January 13, 1903.

The first Korean immigrants came in pursuit of the American Dream and initially served as farmworkers, wage laborers, and section hands. Through resilience, effort, and sacrifice, they established the foundation for their children and future generations. Today, nearly 2 million Korean Americans have honored their ancestors' legacy and achieved the American Dream by transforming all aspects of American life: from Roy Choi, who joined Latino and Korean culture to create new cuisines that have won the stomachs of all Americans; to the first Korean American elected to Congress, Jay Kim; and to the countless Korean Americans who run successful small businesses.

I am honored to represent the largest Korean population in the country and to reintroduce this resolution on the 115th anniversary of the first Korean immigrant arrivals. I call upon my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the Korean Americans who helped strengthen and shape our country.

RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 682, I call up the bill (S. 139) to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 682, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–53, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

S. 139

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 ''FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

TITLE I—ENHANCEMENTS TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION AND SAFEGUARDS, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND OVERSIGHT

SEC. 101. QUERYING PROCEDURES REQUIRED.

(a) QUERYING PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 702 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (f) through (l) as subsections (g) through (m), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f) QUERIES.—

''(1) PROCEDURES REQUIRED.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT TO ADOPT.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall adopt querying procedures consistent with the requirements of the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States for information collected pursuant to an authorization under subsection (a).

''(B) RECORD OF UNITED STATES PERSON QUERY TERMS.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall ensure that the procedures adopted under subparagraph (A) include a technical procedure whereby a record is kept of each United States person query term used for a query.

''(C) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The procedures adopted in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall be subject to judicial review pursuant to subsection (j).

''(2) ACCESS TO RESULTS OF CERTAIN QUERIES CONDUCTED BY FBI.—

''(A) COURT ORDER REQUIRED FOR FBI REVIEW OF CERTAIN QUERY RESULTS IN CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS UNRELATED TO NATIONAL SECURITY.—Except as provided by subparagraph (E), in connection with a predicated criminal investigation opened by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that does not relate to the national security of the United States, the Federal Bureau of Investigation may not access the contents of communications acquired under subsection (a) that were retrieved pursuant to a query made using a United States person query term that was not designed to find and extract foreign intelligence information unless—

''(i) the Federal Bureau of Investigation applies for an order of the Court under subparagraph (C); and

''(ii) the Court enters an order under subparagraph (D) approving such application.

''(B) JURISDICTION.—The Court shall have jurisdiction to review an application and to enter an order approving the access described in subparagraph (A).

''(C) APPLICATION.—Each application for an order under this paragraph shall be made by a Federal officer in writing upon oath or affirmation to a judge having jurisdiction under subparagraph (B). Each application shall require the approval of the Attorney General based upon the finding of the Attorney General that the application satisfies the criteria and requirements of such application, as set forth in this paragraph, and shall include—

''(i) the identity of the Federal officer making the application; and

''(ii) an affidavit or other information containing a statement of the facts and circumstances relied upon by the applicant to justify the belief of the applicant that the contents

of communications described in subparagraph (A) covered by the application would provide evidence of—

''(I) criminal activity;

''(II) contraband, fruits of a crime, or other items illegally possessed by a third party; or

''(III) property designed for use, intended for use, or used in committing a crime.

''(D) ORDER.—Upon an application made pursuant to subparagraph (C), the Court shall enter an order approving the accessing of the contents of communications described in subparagraph (A) covered by the application if the Court finds probable cause to believe that such contents would provide any of the evidence described in subparagraph (C)(ii).

''(E) EXCEPTION.—The requirement for an order of the Court under subparagraph (A) to access the contents of communications described in such subparagraph shall not apply with respect to a query if the Federal Bureau of Investigation determines there is a reasonable belief that such contents could assist in mitigating or eliminating a threat to life or serious bodily harm.

''(F) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed as—

''(i) limiting the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to conduct lawful queries of information acquired under subsection (a);

''(ii) limiting the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to review, without a court order, the results of any query of information acquired under subsection (a) that was reasonably designed to find and extract foreign intelligence information, regardless of whether such foreign intelligence information could also be considered evidence of a crime; or

''(iii) prohibiting or otherwise limiting the ability of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to access the results of queries conducted when evaluating whether to open an assessment or predicated investigation relating to the national security of the United States.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'contents' has the meaning given that term in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code.

''(B) The term 'query' means the use of one or more terms to retrieve the unminimized contents or noncontents located in electronic and data storage systems of communications of or concerning United States persons obtained through acquisitions authorized under subsection (a).''.

(2) APPLICATION.—Subsection (f) of section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a), as added by paragraph (1), shall apply with respect to certifications submitted under subsection (h) of such section to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court after January 1, 2018.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 702 OF FISA.—Such section 702 is further amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''with subsection (i)(3)'' and inserting ''with subsection (j)(3)'';

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''with subsection (g)'' and inserting ''with subsection (h)'';

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''to subsection (i)(3)'' and inserting ''to subsection (j)(3)''; and

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''with subsection (g)'' and inserting ''with subsection (h)''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) by striking ''to subsection (i)(1)(C)'' and inserting ''to subsection (j)(1)(C)''; and

(bb) by striking ''under subsection (i)'' and inserting ''under subsection (j)'';

(C) in subsection (d)(2), by striking ''to subsection (i)'' and inserting ''to subsection (j)'';

(D) in subsection (e)(2), by striking ''to subsection (i)'' and inserting ''to subsection (j)'';

(E) in subsection (h), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in paragraph (2)(A)(iii), by striking ''with subsection (f)'' and inserting ''with subsection (g)'';

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''with subsection (i)(1)(C)'' and inserting ''with subsection (j)(1)(C)''; and

(iii) in paragraph (6), by striking ''to subsection (i)'' and inserting ''to subsection (j)'';

(F) in subsection (j), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''targeting and minimization procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d) and (e)'' and inserting ''targeting, minimization, and querying procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)'';

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''targeting and minimization procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d) and (e)'' and inserting ''targeting, minimization, and querying procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)''; and

(III) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''targeting and minimization procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d) and (e)'' and inserting ''targeting, minimization, and querying procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)'';

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''with subsection (g)'' and inserting ''with subsection (h)''; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) QUERYING PROCEDURES.—The querying procedures adopted in accordance with subsection (f)(1) to assess whether such procedures comply with the requirements of such subsection.'';

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (A)—

(aa) by striking ''with subsection (g)'' and inserting ''with subsection (h)''; and

(bb) by striking ''targeting and minimization procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d) and (e)'' and inserting ''targeting, minimization, and querying procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), in the matter before clause (i)—

(aa) by striking ''with subsection (g)'' and inserting ''with subsection (h)''; and

(bb) by striking ''with subsections (d) and (e)'' and inserting ''with subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)''; and

(iv) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(I) by striking ''with subsection (g)'' and inserting ''with subsection (h)''; and

(II) by striking ''with subsections (d) and (e)'' and inserting ''with subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)''; and

(G) in subsection (m), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in paragraph (1), in the matter before subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''targeting and minimization procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d) and (e)'' and inserting ''targeting, minimization, and querying procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)''; and

(II) by striking ''with subsection (f)'' and inserting ''with subsection (g)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(I) by striking ''targeting and minimization procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d) and (e)'' and inserting ''targeting, minimization, and querying procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)''; and

(II) by striking ''with subsection (f)'' and inserting ''with subsection (g)''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO FISA.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is further amended—

(A) by striking ''section 702(h)'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 702(i)'';

(B) by striking ''section 702(g)'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 702(h)''; and

(C) in section 707(b)(1)(G)(ii), by striking ''subsections (d), (e), and (f)'' and inserting ''subsections (d), (e), (f)(1), and (g)''.

(3) AMENDMENTS TO FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008.—Section 404 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261; 50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(7)(B)—

(i) by striking ''under section 702(i)(3)'' and inserting ''under section 702(j)(3)''; and

(ii) by striking ''of section 702(i)(4)'' and inserting ''of section 702(j)(4)'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''to section 702(h)'' and inserting ''to section 702(i)''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) by striking ''section 702(h)(3) of'' and inserting ''section 702(i)(3) of''; and

(bb) by striking ''to section 702(h)'' and inserting ''to section 702(i)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and sections 702(l)'' and inserting ''and sections 702(m)''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B)(iv), by striking ''or section 702(l)'' and inserting ''or section 702(m)''.

SEC. 102. USE AND DISCLOSURE PROVISIONS.

(a) END USE RESTRICTION.—Section 706(a) (50 U.S.C. 1881e(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Information acquired'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Information acquired''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) UNITED STATES PERSONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any information concerning a United States person acquired under section 702 shall not be used in evidence against that United States person pursuant to paragraph (1) in any criminal proceeding unless—

''(i) the Federal Bureau of Investigation obtained an order of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to access such information pursuant to section 702(f)(2); or

''(ii) the Attorney General determines that—

''(I) the criminal proceeding affects, involves, or is related to the national security of the United States; or

''(II) the criminal proceeding involves—

''(aa) death;

''(bb) kidnapping;

''(cc) serious bodily injury, as defined in section 1365 of title 18, United States Code;

''(dd) conduct that constitutes a criminal offense that is a specified offense against a minor, as defined in section 111 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (34 U.S.C. 20911);

''(ee) incapacitation or destruction of critical infrastructure, as defined in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e));

''(ff) cybersecurity, including conduct described in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e)) or section 1029, 1030, or 2511 of title 18, United States Code;

''(gg) transnational crime, including transnational narcotics trafficking and transnational organized crime; or

''(hh) human trafficking.

''(B) NO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A determination by the Attorney General under subparagraph (A)(ii) is not subject to judicial review.''.

(b) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DISCLOSURE PROVISION.—Section 603 (50 U.S.C. 1873) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''good faith estimate of the number of targets of such orders;'' and inserting the following: ''good faith estimate of—

''(A) the number of targets of such orders;

''(B) the number of targets of such orders who are known to not be United States persons; and

''(C) the number of targets of such orders who are known to be United States persons;'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', including pursuant to subsection (f)(2) of such section,'' after ''section 702'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively;

(iii) by inserting before subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, the following:

''(A) the number of targets of such orders;'';

(iv) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) the number of instances in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation opened, under the Criminal Investigative Division or any successor division, an investigation of a United States person (who is not considered a threat to national security) based wholly or in part on an acquisition authorized under such section;'';

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking ''orders; and'' and inserting the following: ''orders, including—

''(i) the number of targets of such orders who are known to not be United States persons; and

''(ii) the number of targets of such orders who are known to be United States persons; and'';

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) the number of criminal proceedings in which the United States or a State or political subdivision thereof provided notice pursuant to subsection (c) or (d) of section 106 (including with respect to information acquired from an acquisition conducted under section 702) or subsection (d) or (e) of section 305 of the intent of the government to enter into evidence or otherwise use or disclose any information obtained or derived from electronic surveillance, physical search, or an acquisition conducted pursuant to this Act;''; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(4), or (5)'' and inserting ''(5), or (6)'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) by striking ''Paragraphs (2)(A), (2)(B), and (5)(C)'' and inserting ''Paragraphs (2)(B), (2)(C), and (6)(C)''; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except with respect to information required under paragraph (2) relating to orders issued under section 702(f)(2)''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''subsection (b)(2)(B)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(2)(C)''.

SEC. 103. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF ABOUTS COLLECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 702(b) (50 U.S.C. 1881a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) may not intentionally acquire communications that contain a reference to, but are not to or from, a target of an acquisition authorized under subsection (a), except as provided under section 103(b) of the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017; and''.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF ABOUTS COLLECTION.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) The term ''abouts communication'' means a communication that contains a reference to, but is not to or from, a target of an acquisition authorized under section 702(a) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(a)).

(B) The term ''material breach'' means significant noncompliance with applicable law or an order of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court concerning any acquisition of abouts communications.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided in paragraph (4), if the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence intend to implement the authorization of the intentional acquisition of abouts communications, before the first such implementation after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a written notice of the intent to implement the authorization of such an acquisition, and any supporting materials in accordance with this subsection.

(B) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—During the 30-day period beginning on the date written notice is submitted under subparagraph (A), the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the written notice.

(C) LIMITATION ON ACTION DURING CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to paragraph (4), unless the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence make a determination pursuant to section 702(c)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(c)(2)), the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence may not implement the authorization of the intentional acquisition of abouts communications before the end of the period described in subparagraph (B).

(3) WRITTEN NOTICE.—Written notice under paragraph (2)(A) shall include the following:

(A) A copy of any certification submitted to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a), or amendment thereto, authorizing the intentional acquisition of abouts communications, including all affidavits, procedures, exhibits, and attachments submitted therewith.

(B) The decision, order, or opinion of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court approving such certification, and any pleadings, applications, or memoranda of law associated with such decision, order, or opinion.

(C) A summary of the protections in place to detect any material breach.

(D) Data or other results of modeling, simulation, or auditing of sample data demonstrating that any acquisition method involving the intentional acquisition of abouts communications shall be conducted in accordance with title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881 et seq.), if such data or other results exist at the time the written notice is submitted and were provided to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

(E) Except as provided under paragraph (4), a statement that no acquisition authorized under subsection (a) of such section 702 shall include the intentional acquisition of an abouts communication until after the end of the 30-day period described in paragraph (2)(B).

(4) EXCEPTION FOR EMERGENCY ACQUISITION.—

(A) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—If the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence make a determination pursuant to section 702(c)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(c)(2)) with respect to the intentional acquisition of abouts communications, the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence shall notify the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives as soon as practicable, but not later than 7 days after the determination is made.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION OR CONTINUATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court approves a certification that authorizes the intentional acquisition of abouts communications before the end of the 30-day period described in paragraph (2)(B), the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence may authorize the immediate implementation or continuation of that certification if the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence jointly determine that exigent circumstances exist such that without such immediate implementation or continuation intelligence important to the national security of the United States may be lost or not timely acquired.

(ii) NOTICE.—The Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives notification of a determination pursuant to clause (i) as soon as practicable, but not later than 3 days after the determination is made.

(5) REPORTING OF MATERIAL BREACH.—Subsection (m) of section 702 (50 U.S.C. 1881a), as redesignated by section 101, is amended—

(A) in the heading by striking ''AND REVIEWS'' and inserting ''REVIEWS, AND REPORTING''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) REPORTING OF MATERIAL BREACH.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of each element of the intelligence community involved in the acquisition of abouts communications shall fully and currently inform the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the congressional intelligence committees of a material breach.

''(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) The term 'abouts communication' means a communication that contains a reference to, but is not to or from, a target of an acquisition authorized under subsection (a).

''(ii) The term 'material breach' means significant noncompliance with applicable law or an order of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court concerning any acquisition of abouts communications.''.

(6) APPOINTMENT OF AMICI CURIAE BY FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—For purposes of section 103(i)(2)(A) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(2)(A)), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court shall treat the first certification under section 702(h) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1881a(h)) or amendment thereto that authorizes the acquisition of abouts communications as presenting a novel or significant interpretation of the law, unless the court determines otherwise.

SEC. 104. PUBLICATION OF MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES UNDER SECTION 702.

Section 702(e) (50 U.S.C. 1881a(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) PUBLICATION.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall—

''(A) conduct a declassification review of any minimization procedures adopted or amended in accordance with paragraph (1); and

''(B) consistent with such review, and not later than 180 days after conducting such review, make such minimization procedures publicly available to the greatest extent practicable, which may be in redacted form.''.

SEC. 105. SECTION 705 EMERGENCY PROVISION.

Section 705 (50 U.S.C. 1881d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION.—

''(1) CONCURRENT AUTHORIZATION.—If the Attorney General authorized the emergency employment of electronic surveillance or a physical

search pursuant to section 105 or 304, the Attorney General may authorize, for the effective period of the emergency authorization and subsequent order pursuant to section 105 or 304, without a separate order under section 703 or 704, the targeting of a United States person subject to such emergency employment for the purpose of acquiring foreign intelligence information while such United States person is reasonably believed to be located outside the United States.

''(2) USE OF INFORMATION.—If an application submitted to the Court pursuant to section 104 or 303 is denied, or in any other case in which the acquisition pursuant to paragraph (1) is terminated and no order with respect to the target of the acquisition is issued under section 105 or 304, all information obtained or evidence derived from such acquisition shall be handled in accordance with section 704(d)(4).''.

SEC. 106. COMPENSATION OF AMICI CURIAE AND TECHNICAL EXPERTS.

Subsection (i) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(11) COMPENSATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a court established under subsection (a) or (b) may compensate an amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) for assistance provided under such paragraph as the court considers appropriate and at such rate as the court considers appropriate.''.

SEC. 107. ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.—Section 107 (50 U.S.C. 1807) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 107. REPORT OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.

''(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—In April of each year, the Attorney General shall transmit to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and to the congressional intelligence committees and the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report setting forth with respect to the preceding calendar year—

''(1) the total number of applications made for orders and extensions of orders approving electronic surveillance under this title;

''(2) the total number of such orders and extensions either granted, modified, or denied; and

''(3) the total number of subjects targeted by electronic surveillance conducted under an order or emergency authorization under this title, rounded to the nearest 500, including the number of such individuals who are United States persons, reported to the nearest band of 500, starting with 0–499.

''(b) FORM.—Each report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, to the extent consistent with national security. Not later than 7 days after the date on which the Attorney General submits each such report, the Attorney General shall make the report publicly available, or, if the Attorney General determines that the report cannot be made publicly available consistent with national security, the Attorney General may make publicly available an unclassified summary of the report or a redacted version of the report.''.

(b) PEN REGISTERS AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.—Section 406 (50 U.S.C. 1846) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) a good faith estimate of the total number of subjects who were targeted by the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device under an order or emergency authorization issued under this title, rounded to the nearest 500, including—

''(A) the number of such subjects who are United States persons, reported to the nearest band of 500, starting with 0–499; and

''(B) of the number of United States persons described in subparagraph (A), the number of persons whose information acquired pursuant to such order was reviewed or accessed by a Federal officer, employee, or agent, reported to the nearest band of 500, starting with 0–499.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) Each report under subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form, to the extent consistent with national security. Not later than 7 days after the date on which the Attorney General submits such a report, the Attorney General shall make the report publicly available, or, if the Attorney General determines that the report cannot be made publicly available consistent with national security, the Attorney General may make publicly available an unclassified summary of the report or a redacted version of the report.''.

SEC. 108. IMPROVEMENTS TO PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF STAFF.—Subsection (j) of section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(j)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) APPOINTMENT IN ABSENCE OF CHAIRMAN.—If the position of chairman of the Board is vacant, during the period of the vacancy, the Board, at the direction of the unanimous vote of the serving members of the Board, may exercise the authority of the chairman under paragraph (1).''.

(b) MEETINGS.—Subsection (f) of such section (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Board shall'' and inserting ''The Board'';

(2) in paragraph (1) by striking ''make its'' and inserting ''shall make its''; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''hold public'' and inserting ''shall hold public''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', but may, notwithstanding section 552b of title 5, United States Code, meet or otherwise communicate in any number to confer or deliberate in a manner that is closed to the public''.

SEC. 109. PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OFFICERS.

Section 1062(a) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee–1(a)) is amended by inserting '', the Director of the National Security Agency, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation'' after ''the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency''.

SEC. 110. WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR CONTRACTORS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES IN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—Section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3234) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or a contractor employee'' after ''character)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEE.—The term 'contractor employee' means an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, subgrantee, or personal services contractor, of a covered intelligence community element.'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c) CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.—(1) Any employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, subgrantee, or personal services contractor, of a covered intelligence community element who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority, take or fail to take a personnel action with respect to any contractor employee as a reprisal for a lawful disclosure of information by the contractor employee to the Director of National Intelligence (or an employee designated by the Director of National Intelligence for such purpose), the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the head of the contracting agency (or an employee designated by the head of that agency for such purpose), the appropriate inspector general of the contracting agency, a congressional intelligence committee, or a member of a congressional intelligence committee, which the contractor employee reasonably believes evidences—

''(A) a violation of any Federal law, rule, or regulation (including with respect to evidence of another employee or contractor employee accessing or sharing classified information without authorization); or

''(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

''(2) A personnel action under paragraph (1) is prohibited even if the action is undertaken at the request of an agency official, unless the request takes the form of a nondiscretionary directive and is within the authority of the agency official making the request.'';

(4) in subsection (b), by striking the heading and inserting ''AGENCY EMPLOYEES.—''; and

(5) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by inserting ''contractor employee,'' after ''any employee,''.

(b) FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, subgrantee, or personal services contractor, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority, take or fail to take a personnel action with respect to a contractor employee as a reprisal for a disclosure of information—

(A) made—

(i) to a supervisor in the direct chain of command of the contractor employee;

(ii) to the Inspector General;

(iii) to the Office of Professional Responsibility of the Department of Justice;

(iv) to the Office of Professional Responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(v) to the Inspection Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(vi) to the Office of Special Counsel; or

(vii) to an employee designated by any officer, employee, office, or division described in clauses (i) through (vii) for the purpose of receiving such disclosures; and

(B) which the contractor employee reasonably believes evidences—

(i) any violation of any law, rule, or regulation (including with respect to evidence of another employee or contractor employee accessing or sharing classified information without authorization); or

(ii) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

(2) ACTIONS BY REQUEST.—A personnel action under paragraph (1) is prohibited even if the action is undertaken at the request of an official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, unless the request takes the form of a nondiscretionary directive and is within the authority of the official making the request.

(3) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to ensure that a personnel action described in paragraph (1) shall not be taken against a contractor employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a reprisal for any disclosure of information described in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph.

(4) ENFORCEMENT.—The President shall provide for the enforcement of this subsection.

(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) The term ''contractor employee'' means an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, subgrantee, or personal services contractor, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(B) The term ''personnel action'' means any action described in clauses (i) through (x) of section 2302(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, with respect to a contractor employee.

(c) RETALIATORY REVOCATION OF SECURITY CLEARANCES AND ACCESS DETERMINATIONS.—Section 3001(j) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) INCLUSION OF CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.—In this subsection, the term 'employee' includes an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, subgrantee, or personal services contractor, of an agency. With respect to such employees, the term 'employing agency' shall be deemed to be the contracting agency.''.

SEC. 111. BRIEFING ON NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall provide to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a briefing with respect to how the Department of Justice interprets the requirements under sections 106(c), 305(d), and 405(c) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1806(c), 1825(d), and 1845(c)) to notify an aggrieved person under such sections of the use of information obtained or derived from electronic surveillance, physical search, or the use of a pen register or trap and trace device. The briefing shall focus on how the Department interprets the phrase ''obtained or derived from'' in such sections.

SEC. 112. INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT ON QUERIES CONDUCTED BY FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court first approves the querying procedures adopted pursuant to section 702(f) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(f)), as added by section 101, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing a review by the Inspector General of the interpretation of, and compliance with, such procedures by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, an assessment of the following:

(1) The interpretations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the National Security Division of the Department of Justice, respectively, relating to the querying procedures adopted under subsection (f) of section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(f)), as added by section 101.

(2) The handling by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of individuals whose citizenship status is unknown at the time of a query conducted under such section 702.

(3) The practice of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to retaining records of queries conducted under such section 702 for auditing purposes.

(4) The training or other processes of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to ensure compliance with such querying procedures.

(5) The implementation of such querying procedures with respect to queries conducted when evaluating whether to open an assessment or predicated investigation relating to the national security of the United States.

(6) The scope of access by the criminal division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to information obtained pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), including with respect to information acquired under subsection (a) of such section 702 based on queries conducted by the criminal division.

(7) The frequency and nature of the reviews conducted by the National Security Division of the Department of Justice and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence relating to the compliance by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with such querying procedures.

(8) Any impediments, including operational, technical, or policy impediments, for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to count—

(A) the total number of queries where the Federal Bureau of Investigation subsequently accessed information acquired under subsection (a) of such section 702;

(B) the total number of such queries that used known United States person identifiers; and

(C) the total number of queries for which the Federal Bureau of Investigation received an order of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court pursuant to subsection (f)(2) of such section 702.

(c) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form to the extent consistent with national security, but may include a classified annex.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES, INCREASED PENALTIES, REPORTS, AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF TITLE VII OF FISA; EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 403(b) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261; 122 Stat. 2474) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''December 31, 2017'' and inserting ''December 31, 2023''; and

(B) by inserting ''and by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017'' after ''section 101(a)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''December 31, 2017'' and inserting ''December 31, 2023''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 404(b) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261; 122 Stat. 2476), as amended by section 101, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DECEMBER 31, 2017'' and inserting ''DECEMBER 31, 2023''; and

(B) by inserting ''and by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017'' after ''section 101(a)'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017'' after ''section 101(a)''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting ''and amended by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017'' after ''as added by section 101(a)'' both places it appears; and

(B) by inserting ''and by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017'' after ''as amended by section 101(a)'' both places it appears.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS TO FAA.—The amendments made to the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261) by this section shall take effect on December 31, 2017.

SEC. 202. INCREASED PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED REMOVAL AND RETENTION OF CLASSIFIED DOCUMENTS OR MATERIAL.

Section 1924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''one year'' and inserting ''five years''.

SEC. 203. REPORT ON CHALLENGES TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report on current and future challenges to the effectiveness of the foreign intelligence surveillance activities of the United States authorized under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A discussion of any trends that currently challenge the effectiveness of the foreign intelligence surveillance activities of the United States, or could foreseeably challenge such activities during the decade following the date of the report, including with respect to—

(A) the extraordinary and surging volume of data occurring worldwide;

(B) the use of encryption;

(C) changes to worldwide telecommunications patterns or infrastructure;

(D) technical obstacles in determining the location of data or persons;

(E) the increasing complexity of the legal regime, including regarding requests for data in the custody of foreign governments;

(F) the current and future ability of the United States to obtain, on a compulsory or voluntary basis, assistance from telecommunications providers or other entities; and

(G) any other matters the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence determine appropriate.

(2) Recommendations for changes, including, as appropriate, fundamental changes, to the foreign intelligence surveillance activities of the United States to address the challenges identified under paragraph (1) and to ensure the long-term effectiveness of such activities.

(3) Recommendations for any changes to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) that the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence determine necessary to address the challenges identified under paragraph (1).

(c) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

SEC. 204. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON THE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the classification system of the United States and the methods by which the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4))) protects classified information.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study under subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) Whether sensitive information is properly classified.

(2) The effect of modern technology on the storage and protection of classified information, including with respect to—

(A) using cloud storage for classified information; and

(B) any technological means to prevent or detect unauthorized access to such information.

(3) Any ways to improve the classification system of the United States, including with respect to changing the levels of classification used in such system and to reduce overclassification.

(4) How to improve the authorized sharing of classified information, including with respect to sensitive compartmented information.

(5) The value of polygraph tests in determining who is authorized to access classified information and in investigating unauthorized disclosures of classified information.

(6) Whether each element of the intelligence community—

(A) applies uniform standards in determining who is authorized to access classified information; and

(B) provides proper training with respect to the handling of classified information and the avoidance of overclassification.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report containing the study under subsection (a).

(d) FORM.—The report under subsection (c) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 205. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS AND AMENDMENTS TO IMPROVE PROCEDURES OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.

(a) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 103(b) (50 U.S.C. 1803(b)), by striking ''designate as the'' and inserting ''designated as the''.

(2) In section 302(a)(1)(A)(iii) (50 U.S.C. 1822(a)(1)(A)(iii)), by striking ''paragraphs (1) through (4)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (A) through (D)''.

(3) In section 406(b) (50 U.S.C. 1846(b)), by striking ''and to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate''.

(4) In section 604(a) (50 U.S.C. 1874(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1)(D), by striking ''contents'' and inserting ''contents,''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''comply in the into'' and inserting ''comply into''.

(5) In section 701 (50 U.S.C. 1881)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''The terms'' and inserting ''In this title, the terms''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by inserting ''In this title:'' after the subsection heading; and

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking ''(50 U.S.C. 401a(4))'' and inserting ''(50 U.S.C. 3003(4))''.

(6) In section 702(h)(2)(A)(i) (50 U.S.C. 1881a(h)(2)(A)(i)), as redesignated by section 101, by inserting ''targeting'' before ''procedures in place''.

(7) In section 801(7) (50 U.S.C. 1885(7)), by striking ''(50 U.S.C. 401a(4))'' and inserting ''(50 U.S.C. 3003(4))''.

(b) COURT-RELATED AMENDMENTS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is further amended as follows:

(1) In section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803)—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking ''immediately''; and

(B) in subsection (h), by striking ''the court established under subsection (a)'' and inserting ''a court established under this section''.

(2) In section 105(d) (50 U.S.C. 1805(d)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) A denial of the application made under section 104 may be reviewed as provided in section 103.''.

(3) In section 302(d) (50 U.S.C. 1822(d)), by striking ''immediately''.

(4) In section 402(d) (50 U.S.C. 1842(d)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.''.

(5) In section 403(c) (50 U.S.C. 1843(c)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) A denial of the application made under subsection (a)(2) may be reviewed as provided in section 103.''.

(6) In section 501(c) (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.''.

SEC. 206. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act, of any such amendments, and of the application of such provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 115–504, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, S. 139.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 139.

On January 19, the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 will expire. This vital legislation includes section 702, which permits the government to target foreign citizens located overseas to obtain foreign intelligence information. Section 702 is one of the most, if not the most, critical national security tool used by our intelligence community to obtain intelligence on foreign terrorists located overseas.

Now, some claim section 702 vacuums bulk information without due regard to the intended target. This assertion is simply false. Section 702 is a targeted program, with roughly 106,000 foreign targets worldwide. Given that the worldwide population is about 7.5 billion, this program can hardly be described as bulk collection.

Section 702 targets spies, terrorists, weapons proliferators, and other foreign adversaries who threaten the United States, and locating them is crucial to protecting our troops and our homeland.

As an example, Hajji Iman, who was the second-in-command of ISIS, was located via section 702 and later removed from the battlefield. While the vast majority of examples remain classified, this is just one instance that demonstrates the necessity of this authority.

Subject to multiple layers of oversight by all three branches of government, section 702 is one of the government's most rigorously overseen foreign intelligence collection authorities. To date, while compliance incidents occur and are dealt with appropriately, there has never been a known, intentional abuse of this authority. Nevertheless, the program should be subject to regular adjustments, as necessary, to ensure the effectiveness of privacy protections.

Therefore, after careful consideration of the best way to strengthen privacy protections without hindering the program's effectiveness, the committee supports S. 139, a bipartisan bill that includes provisions and addresses concerns raised by the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate.

The bill's reforms include:

Requiring specific section 702 query procedures, separate from existing minimization procedures, which must be reviewed by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court every year;

Limiting the instances in which the government can use section 702 information to prosecute U.S. people;

Requiring the inspector general of the Department of Justice to conduct a review of the FBI's interpretation and implementation of the FBI's section 702 query procedures;

Temporarily codifying the end of the NSA's section 702 upstream ''abouts'' collection until the government develops new procedures and briefs the congressional Intelligence and Judiciary Committees;

And, finally, improving transparency by mandating the publication of section 702 minimization procedures and requiring additional reporting to Congress on how the intelligence community is using other FISA authorities.

Mr. Speaker, during discussions over the past several months, both the House and the Senate have made several concessions to achieve this compromised language in order to reauthorize this critical national security authority. Accordingly, S. 139 now includes a probable cause-based order requirement for the FBI to access the content of a section 702 communication during FBI criminal investigations on Americans, unrelated to national security.

This order requirement does not reflect the committee's belief or intent that law enforcement access to lawfully acquired information constitutes a separate search under the Fourth Amendment. The Fourth Amendment, as interpreted by numerous Federal courts, does not require the FBI to obtain a separate order from the FISC to review lawfully acquired 702 information.

Though not required by the Constitution, this compromise is meant to provide additional protections for U.S.

person information that is incidentally collected under section 702. Along with the restrictions on the use of section 702 information in criminal prosecutions, this should provide further assurances to the American public that this vital national security tool is used strictly to discover and mitigate foreign threats to the United States, and the handling and use of any incidental U.S. person information is carefully controlled and monitored.

Mr. Speaker, America faces an array of international threats more complicated than anything we have endured in the past.

□ 0930

Speaking for the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, I cannot emphasize enough that now is not the time to draw back on key national security authorities.

I am dismayed by the amount of disinformation being propagated by those who oppose section 702 for purely ideological reasons. When Congress must reauthorize this program again in 2023, we hope those who debate these issues, both inside and outside this Chamber, do so with intellectual honesty and integrity.

The USA RIGHTS Act, which has been offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute, is an attempt to kill this compromise. In its place, the amendment would begin resurrecting the information-sharing walls between national security and law enforcement that the 9/11 Commission identified as a major factor in the failure to identify and thwart the 9/11 plot.

If individuals in this body cannot learn from history, they are doomed to repeat it. There is no support for this bill in the majority of the committees of jurisdiction whose members understand that this amendment would render section 702 inoperable.

Therefore, in order to keep the U.S. interests and troops abroad safe from harm, we must ensure that the intelligence community has the tools it needs to provide intelligence to our soldiers abroad. Section 702 is critical in that regard, and S. 139 provides the intelligence community with the authorities needed to protect the homeland while implementing key privacy enhancements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of S. 139, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as HPSCI's ranking member and a former member of the Judiciary Committee, I have long advocated for reforms to surveillance authorities to balance the imperatives of national security and counterterrorism with the privacy rights and civil liberties of Americans.

Today, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act seeks to reauthorize the program while making changes to protect privacy interests. Nonetheless, and I indicated before we took up the bill, in light of the significant concerns that have been raised by members of our Caucus, and in light of the irresponsible and inherently contradictory messages coming out of the White House today, I would recommend that we withdraw consideration of the bill today to give us more time to address the privacy questions that have been raised as well as to get a clear statement from the administration about their position on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do this reluctantly. Section 702, I think, is among the most important of all of our surveillance programs. Nonetheless, I think that the issues that have been raised will need more time to be resolved, and I think we need to get a clear statement from the administration of whether they are in support of this legislation or they are not.

This morning, as my colleagues are aware, the President issued a statement via Twitter suggesting that this authority was used illegally by the Obama administration to surveil him. Of course, that is blatantly untrue but, nonetheless, casts an additional cloud over the debate today.

In light of these circumstances, I think the better course would be for us to defer consideration, give us more time to address the issues that have been raised by the privacy community within my own Caucus, but also within the administration about its inaccurate, conflicting, and confusing statements on the morning of debate.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly urge my colleagues to postpone consideration so that we can take up this bill when it is more ripe for consideration.

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Utah. While I am not unappreciative of my colleague from California's comments, I do think we are at a place where we do need to move forward. If we succumb to the emotions of what is going on around us and don't stick to the facts, stick to what we are trying to get done, I think that we do that to our detriment. So I have great respect for my colleague and his opinions, but I personally believe that plays into the emotions of what is going on rather than the facts of what is going on. If we can, I believe we should just continue to push forward.

First, let me say that the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act is a bipartisan compromise bill that preserves the operational flexibility of section 702 while instituting key reforms to further protect U.S. personal privacy.

One of the major issues discussed over the past year has been NSA's ''abouts communication'' collection—a tortured title, but, nevertheless, we will stick with the phrase, ''abouts communication.'' So ''abouts communication'' collection takes place in NSA's upstream collection and, due to how the internet communications work, allows NSA to collect the communications that may reference a section 702 target's email address.

Despite what some of my colleagues may push in their propaganda, ''abouts'' collection does not collect names of targets, just selectors. Some of my colleagues also suggest that ''abouts communication'' is inherently in violation of the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

While the FISA court has raised concerns about ''abouts communication'' collections in the past, NSA has been able to conduct such collections with the approval of the FISA court. This type of collection is at issue today because it was the subject to a compliance incident in 2016. NSA self-reported a problem to the FISA court and decided to cease ''abouts communication'' collection until a fix could be implemented and demonstrated to the court. I would like to note that that type of self-reporting of compliance incidents is expected of the intelligence community elements and proves that oversight mechanisms are in place and that they work.

Other potential legislation, including the amendments to today's base bill, would seek to permanently end ''abouts communication'' collection. This is a shortsighted and a dangerous proposition that will limit the NSA's ability to identify threat networks in the future.

Rather than ending ''abouts communication'' collection, S. 139 strikes, I believe, that right balance. If NSA wants to reestablish ''abouts communication'' collection, NSA would first need to go back to court, convince the judge that it has satisfied the court's concerns. After achieving judicial approval that NSA has made the necessary technical changes, NSA would then brief congressional Intelligence and Judiciary Committees on how they plan to reinstitute this type of collection. Barring congressional action, NSA can then start ''abouts communication'' collection, 30 days after those briefings.

Some of our opponents to S. 139 claim that 30 days is not enough. To the folks that claim that 30 days is not enough, there is nothing stopping Congress from acting after that 30-day window. However, NSA should not be penalized and America's security should not be compromised and prevented from obtaining valuable foreign intelligence information that the FISA court has deemed consistent with the Fourth Amendment just because Congress can't pass legislation in 30 days.

This compromise of the bill that is on the floor today, I believe, is the right answer, and I hope my colleagues will support S. 139.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, I would reluctantly urge that we withdraw consideration of the bill for today. I certainly have been working as hard, I

think, as anyone to try to agree to a compromise that would move forward this very important surveillance authority but would strike the right balance between our security interests and our privacy interests, but I do think we need more time to work on this bill. And I think that it was only underscored this morning with the contradictory statements coming out of the administration.

An issue of this magnitude and this seriousness really deserves serious and sober consideration. I think we need more time to discuss this with our Members, and I would urge my colleagues not to bring this to a vote today to give us more time to work on it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues believe that Congress should go above and beyond what is required by the Fourth Amendment and institute additional safeguards on how the government handles any potential U.S. personal information that may be incidentally collected under section 702. While the varying committees may have different ideas as to how to strike the right balance between additional privacy measures and national security, the art of the compromise brings us to the current junction.

Under S. 139, if the bill conducts a U.S.-person query into its database during a criminal investigation not related to national security and conducts a section 702 communication, the FBI must obtain an order from the FISA court prior to assessing the content of the communication.

The committee does not believe that such an order is necessary under the Fourth Amendment, but it is adding more protections, as a matter of policy, in order to address unfounded concerns by opponents of section 702 that the authority is being used to investigate U.S. people.

Proponents of the USA RIGHTS Act amendment will say that S. 139 does not go far enough in its current form and that they have crafted a great compromise that allows the intelligence community to do its job.

Unfortunately, they are selling a poison pill that is extraordinarily harmful to our national security. Per the office of the Director of National Intelligence, under the USA RIGHTS Act amendment, the FBI would not be able to look at lawfully collected data related to suspicious activities similar to that of the 9/11 hijackers. This is unethical to the 9/11 Commission Report, and anyone who thinks about voting for the USA RIGHTS Act amendment should pick up a copy and skim it prior to voting.

Unlike the USA RIGHTS Act amendment, S. 139 is able to balance national security and privacy while adhering to the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission reporting. I echo the White House statement last night strongly opposing the USA RIGHTS Act amendment, and I urge all of my colleagues in the House to support S. 139.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 139, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act. As a former United States attorney, I know firsthand the enormous value that programs like section 702 provide in protecting our country.

The worst threats have been thwarted due to our intelligence and law enforcement communities having tools like section 702. Chairman GOODLATTE, along with the members of the Judiciary Committee, worked diligently on legislation to implement meaningful reforms while ensuring the law enforcement and Intelligence Committee still had the necessary tools available. This bill includes many other reforms from the USA Liberty Act, enhances section 702 protections, and maintains law enforcement abilities.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all Members to join me in voting ''yes'' on this legislation to implement real reforms, while ensuring that we still provide the tools necessary to keep American citizens safe.

In conclusion, as a U.S. attorney, I have used this section. My office used this section. We followed the law to the letter. There were no complaints, and I want the American people to realize something: we in law enforcement, law enforcement throughout the U.S., we have to be right and on spot every second of every day. It only takes a terrorist a moment to get lucky and set off a bomb killing Americans.

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

□ 0945

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

I rise in strong opposition to the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017, which reauthorizes section 702 of FISA for 6 years without enacting adequate protections for our privacy.

Supporters of this measure want to convince us a new, incredibly narrow warrant provision actually constitutes reform. It does not. Our right to privacy does not begin when the Department of Justice has a fully formed criminal case against us, nor does it begin when prosecutors enter our emails and text messages into evidence against us in court.

The Constitution guarantees far more than this. Our right to privacy protects us when the government first makes its decision to search our private communications for information it might find useful. S. 139 falls well short of this basic guarantee. We, therefore, cannot—we must not—support this bill.

Make no mistake: S. 139 is not a compromise. The Judiciary Committee, the technology companies, civil society, and other critical stakeholders were shut out of this conversation long ago.

S. 139 does not include a meaningful warrant requirement. The rule in this bill does not apply to most searches of the section 702 database. It does not apply to a query for any information that ''could mitigate a threat,'' an exception that threatens to swallow the entire rule. As a result, S. 139 allows the FBI unfettered access to this information for purely domestic nonterrorism cases without a warrant.

What does that mean in the year of Jeff Sessions and Donald Trump? It means that absolutely nothing stops the Department of Justice from trolling the database for evidence that you use marijuana or failed to pay your taxes or may be in the country unlawfully or possess a firearm that you should not have. None of these cases have anything to do with the core purposes of section 702, and all of them should require a warrant based on individualized suspicion and probable cause.

I agree with Chairman GOODLATTE that section 702 should be reauthorized. I understand its importance to the intelligence agencies. But none of us should support this bill which pretends at reform while codifying some of the worst practices of the intelligence community in domestic crimes.

When we came to Congress, each of us took an oath to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States. I ask that each of my colleagues honor that oath today and that we work together to defeat this bill and to bring the right set of reforms to the floor without delay.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am a former prosecutor and a former judge. I despise terrorists. We ought to go after them and get them. Section 702 was written to go after terrorists, but it is being used to go after Americans.

Normally, when I was a judge, I would sign a warrant. Before the government could go into your house, they had to have a warrant to go into the house and to seize something based on probable cause.

Under FISA, as it is used against Americans—forget the terrorists—as it is used against Americans, government has already seized your house of communications, all of it. They look around, and sometimes—sometimes—they go back to a secret judge in a secret court and get a secret warrant by a FISA judge, and they come in and seize something and prosecute based on something irrelevant about terrorism. That is why this bill violates the Fourth Amendment.

Get a warrant before you go into the house of communications and effects

and papers of Americans or stay out of that house. These documents have been seized. Communications have been seized by government. They are kept forever.

Keep government out. Without a warrant, you stay out, because government, as we learned from the British, cannot be trusted.

Get a warrant. Stay out of the house of communications.

Vote against this bill. Let's redraft it and protect Americans.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, like the ranking member, I oppose this bill. It does not meet the standards that we should have for adhering to the Constitution.

Now, this is a confusing debate in some ways because what is it we are talking about?

We are all against terrorism, and we have authorized the collection of data of terrorists communicating with each other. In section 702, if they communicate with somebody here, we can collect that, too.

But because of the architecture of the internet, we are collecting vast amounts—we can't go into the numbers here in open session—vast amounts of data. It is not metadata; it is content. It is the content of your phone calls, content of your emails, and the content of your text messages and video messages. Under section 702, you can search that for Americans for crimes that have nothing to do with terrorism. We should change that.

As Judge POE has said, you need a warrant to go after Americans for a nonterrorism crime. There is a reason why a left-right coalition—the NAACP and FreedomWorks, Color of Change and Gun Owners of America—has joined together on the same point of view. We should stand up for the privacy rights of Americans and reject this bill and have a warrant requirement for searching for the information of Americans that is in this vast database.

Just one further point: The very weak predicate criminal investigation trigger for a warrant which is at the end of the investigation would apply only to the FBI. So if you are the ATF, you would never have to get a warrant. If you were the DEA, you would never have to get a warrant. This bill is inadequate, and it ought to be defeated.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to control the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as you all know, the Judiciary Committee worked diligently for a year on legislation that does two things: one, protect Americans' civil liberties by requiring a court order to access section 702 data during domestic criminal investigations; and, two, reauthorize the 702 program, which is our Nation's most indispensable national security tool.

We achieved that by passing the USA Liberty Act in the House Judiciary Committee last year by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, which is no easy task; however, we were able to responsibly balance civil liberties with national security.

The bill we will vote on today was drafted in the spirit of the USA Liberty Act. It is not perfect and the process getting here was not ideal, but the bill requires, for the first time, a warrant to access section 702-collected communications on U.S. persons in criminal investigations.

Moreover, in routine criminal cases, when the FBI accesses U.S. person communications that were incidentally collected without first obtaining a warrant, the FBI will not be permitted to use those communications in a criminal prosecution. This will prevent a national security tool from advancing run-of-the-mill criminal prosecutions.

These are meaningful reforms. The bill that was presented to us before Christmas with its optional warrant construct was not real reform. The bill we are debating today, however, contains meaningful reforms.

I would have preferred to include additional reforms, but I cannot stress to my colleagues enough that our choice cannot be between a perfect reform bill and expiration of this program. The 702 program is far too important for that. With this bill, we can have meaningful reform and reauthorization. In its current form, this bill will pass the Senate.

I also want to caution everyone that we cannot go too far in seeking to alter this program. There is an amendment that will be offered sponsored by Mr. AMASH and Ms. LOFGREN that would prevent the FBI from ever querying its 702 database using a U.S. person term.

Imagine the FBI getting a tip from a flight instructor whose student acts suspiciously by expressing great interest in learning how to take off and fly a plane but has no interest in learning how to land the plane. This could be innocent behavior, but we want law enforcement to at least be able to perform a search to see if they already have, in their possession, any communications between the student and a foreign actor involved in organizing terrorist plots.

The Judiciary Committee-passed bill would have allowed the search and allowed law enforcement to view the metadata without a warrant while requiring a warrant to view the content of the communications.

The Amash-Lofgren amendment, which was rejected in the Judiciary Committee, goes too far and would prevent such a search from even being done. It would, thus, kill this critical program by preventing the FBI from even looking at its own databases without a warrant, rendering it ineffective in preventing terrorist attacks and stifling its ability to gather necessary intelligence. It must not be adopted.

I will vote to support this bill. I will oppose the Amash-Lofgren amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me. Vote for reform and reauthorization.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us are opposing this bill and supporting the amendment because it is very different from the Judiciary Committee bill that we reported, which was a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Supporters of this bill have called it reform. This is not reform. It is a massive expansion of the government's ability to pry into the private lives of innocent people. If you need proof, just look at the bill's section 702 which is supposed to authorize spying on foreign adversaries, but it has emboldened some in law enforcement to collect and read private communications of American citizens without a warrant.

Instead of curbing these practices, S. 139 would codify and expand some of the most abusive of surveillance practices used in recent years, including ''abouts'' collection and backdoor searches.

There is no more important responsibility that we have than keeping the American people safe, but we have to do it in a way that is consistent with our values and our Constitution. This bill undermines our values of privacy and freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures.

I urge my colleagues to oppose S. 139 and to support the Amash-Lofgren amendment, which allows intelligence agencies to do their jobs without undermining our values as Americans. We can do both things, Mr. Speaker: keep the American people safe and honor and respect our Constitution, which protects the privacy of all American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of this bill and support of the amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership in ensuring that a number of important reforms to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act were included in this legislation.

I rise in support of this modified version of S. 139. While this does not go as far to reform FISA section 702 as the USA Liberty Act, which passed out of the Judiciary Committee in November with my support, the reforms that are included help to provide a more appropriate balance between protecting our

civil liberties and providing the intelligence community an important national security tool for another 6 years before its expiration this Friday.

FISA section 702 is a critical tool used by the intelligence community to protect American citizens from foreign threats and has been successfully used numerous times to prevent terrorist plots. Since we last reauthorized FISA section 702, much has changed not only in who our foreign threats are, but also in the methods that they use against us. The bottom line is we need to protect the safety of the American people. We need to make sure constitutional protections are in place, and this is the proper balance.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat the refrain of those of us who are members of the Judiciary Committee who have gone through this process since 9/11, and that is that we support the integrity and the importance of section 702 as a national security tool, and we want it reauthorized, but we want it right.

Our job and our task is also to be the protectors of the Fourth Amendment, and that is the protection of the American people against unreasonable search and seizure.

No matter how much my friends on the other side of the aisle argue, we know that the FBI can have the tools that it needs; but, in the instance of this underlying bill, similar to the bill that was passed in 2007 by the Bush administration, on which the Judiciary Committee came back and amended it and made it a bill that provides the tools that were needed by those who are on the front lines in the United States military and the FBI, ultimately, it was changed to deny those rights.

In this instance, the warrant that my friends are talking about is revised only to fully predicated cases. It does not apply to the searching of documents that will have information about Americans.

I ask my colleagues to postpone this. Let us work together on behalf of the American people. Who are we if we cannot uphold the Constitution? It is not protected in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I rise in strong opposition to S. 139, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017.''

S. 139 reauthorizes Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which is scheduled to expire on January 19, 2018.

Section 702 authorizes the Justice Department and NSA to collect non-U.S. persons' communications that are sent while abroad.

The collection programs have to be approved each year by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISA Court).

The FISA Court was set up by the 1978 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA; Public Law 95–511) to oversee intelligence-gathering activities and ensure compliance with the U.S. Constitution.

Under FISA, the term ''U.S. person'' covers citizens, green card holders, associations with a ''substantial number of members'' who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents, and U.S.-incorporated companies.

Title VII also allows intelligence agencies to conduct surveillance on a specific U.S. person reasonably believed to be outside of the country, with the approval of the FISA Court.

The NSA's use of section 702 authority to collect Americans' information from their communications with foreign surveillance targets was revealed by former government contractor Edward Snowden in 2013.

Snowden also revealed that the NSA obtains communications from U.S.-based providers such as Google, Verizon, and Facebook.

Although Section 702 is a critical national security tool set to expire on January 19, 2018, events of the recent past strongly suggest that Section 702 should not be reauthorized without necessary and significant reforms that are not included in the legislation before us.

So as the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I oppose the bill for several compelling reasons:

1. S. 139 fails to address the core concerns of Members of Congress and the American public—the government's use of Section 702 information against United States citizens investigations that have nothing to do with national security.

2. The warrant ''requirement'' contained in the bill is riddled with loopholes and applies only to fully predicated, official FBI investigations, not to the hundreds of thousands searches the FBI runs every day to run down a lead or check out a tip.

3. S. 139 exacerbates existing problems with Section 702 by codifying so-called ''about collection,'' a type of surveillance that was shut down after it twice failed to meet Fourth Amendment scrutiny.

4. S. 139 is universally opposed by technology companies, privacy, and civil liberties groups across the political spectrum from the ACLU to FreedomWorks.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us comes from the Intelligence Committee, where it was passed on a strict party-line vote.

This stands in stark contrast to H.R. 3989, the USA Liberty Act the bipartisan bill reported by the Judiciary Committee after multiple hearings, an open markup process, and a bipartisan vote of approval.

The USA Liberty Act enjoys much broader support, contains meaningful reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and is far superior to the bill before us.

Inexplicably, the House Republican leadership did choose the best option, which was to bring the USA Liberty Act to the floor for debate and vote; instead, they chose the worst option, which is S. 139, the bill before us.

For this reason, I urge all members to join me in supporting the Amash-Lofgren Amendment, the best option remaining before us.

The Amash-Lofgren strike the text of S. 139 in its entirety and substitutes in its place the text of the ''Uniting and Strengthening America by Reforming and Improving the Government's High-Tech Surveillance Act'' (''USA RIGHTS Act'').

In contrast to S. 139, the ''USA RIGHTS Act'' enacts necessary and meaningful reforms to Section 702, which are necessary in light of the past abuses of surveillance authorities, contemporary noncompliance with this authority, and the danger posed by potential future abuses.

First, the USA RIGHTS Act creates a search warrant requirement that closes the so-called ''backdoor search loophole'' through which the government searches, without first obtaining a court-issued warrant based on probable cause, for information about U.S. persons or persons inside the U.S.

The ''USA RIGHTS Act'' provides an exception for emergencies, but requires a court warrant afterward.

Second, the ''USA RIGHTS Act'' prohibits the collection of domestic communications and permanently ends ''about'' collection, an illegal practice the National Security Agency recently stopped because of persistent and significant compliance violations.

This is important because while ''reverse targeting'' is prohibited under the Jackson Lee Amendment incorporated in the USA Freedom Act enacted on June 2, 2016 (Pub. L. 114–23), this prohibition was often skirted by collecting information from communications that merely mention an intelligence target.

Under the ''USA RIGHTS Act'', collections would be limited to communications that are ''to'' or ''from'' a target, and the intentional collection of wholly domestic communications is prohibited.

Third, the ''USA RIGHTS Act'' requires the government give notice when it uses information obtained or derived from Section 702 surveillance in proceedings against U.S. persons or people on U.S. soil which will enable a defendant to assert his or her constitutional rights and help ensure that foreign intelligence surveillance is not being misused.

Fourth, under the ''USA RIGHTS Act'', Section 702 authority sunsets in 4 years, which will obligate the Congress to exercise regular oversight and provide the opportunity to make necessary reforms before reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act was enacted to protect the liberty and security of Americans, not to diminish their constitutional rights.

All Americans want to find the common ground where commonsense rules and regulations relating to fighting terrorism at home and abroad can exist while still protecting the cherished privacy and civil liberties which Americans hold close to our collective hearts.

That is why Section 702 should not be reauthorized with reforms to prevent the government from using information against its political opponents or members of religious, ethnic, or other groups.

One way to do that without interfering with the national security objectives of 702 surveillance is simply to reject S. 139 and support the USA RIGHTS Act by voting for the Amash-Lofgren Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I noted in an op-ed published way back in October 2007, that as Alexis de Tocqueville, the most astute student of American democracy, observed nearly two centuries ago, the reason democracies invariably prevail in any military conflict is because democracy is the governmental form that best rewards and encourages those traits that are indispensable to success: initiative, innovation, courage, and a love of justice.

And the best way to keep America safe and strong is to remain true to the valued embedded in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

S. 139 does not strike the proper balance between our cherished liberties and smart security.

We can do better; we should reject S. 139 and support the Amash-Lofgren Amendment.

□ 1000

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, and I will speak later on some of the other parts.

I want to talk about the ''abouts'' stuff that is reauthorized in this bill after the NSA itself stopped doing it earlier last year.

What ''abouts'' collection means is that, for example, if you have two jihadists that are in Pakistan and are communicating with each other that they didn't like something that Mr. NADLER said against jihadists, the FBI can pick up the name ''Nadler'' and go into all of his emails, all of his texts, all of the information that they have on him and be able to see what Mr. NADLER had said about jihadists and much, much more. That is why this bill opens the door to something that the NSA has closed itself.

We will hear from people who support ''abouts'' collection that Congress has got a chance to review it. They give us 30 days to do it. We can't get anything done in 30 days.

Vote ''no'' on the bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, having served on Active Duty in the United States military, when it comes to foreign terrorists on foreign soil, we need to track them down and kill them. That is why I support the FISA Act, as applied to foreigners.

But, unfortunately, this act has now been used to apply to Americans. If you are going to do that, you need to follow the Constitution, you need to put in a warrant requirement. Unfortunately, the Nunes FISA bill does not do that. That is why I support the USA RIGHTS amendment.

At the end of the day, this is not about terrorists or terrorism. It is about: Can you use warrantless information against Americans in a domestic court?

That is what this issue is about. Don't let the intelligence agencies scare you.

Vote ''no'' on the Nunes bill and ''yes'' on the USA RIGHTS amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 2¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, our times are this: the President is abusing his authority. He is stacking the courts with incompetent and ideological judges. He is usurping the powers of the Justice Department and the FBI. He is turning them into political animals.

At the same time as he is doing this, we are considering this legislation, which leaves the door wide open for the abuse of Fourth Amendment rights of Americans.

This is a bad bill for a particularly bad time. I am asking my colleagues to vote ''no.'' We can do better than this. I am asking my colleagues to vote in favor of the USA RIGHTS amendment. If that amendment is not passed, then I ask Members to vote ''no'' on this overall bill. We can't afford to let this happen.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, in response to those who advocate for the Amash-Lofgren amendment, this amendment will very, very seriously damage our national security. Section 702 is a program for which there is no evidence of abuse and is used to gather information about non-United States citizens outside the United States. In a targeted fashion, they have to go to the court and get approval for the selectors to gather information on a quarterly basis. They gather information incidental to that. Sometimes there is information about United States citizens.

But guess what. The information does not come with little labels attached saying: this is a United States citizen communicating here, or the communication involves someone in the United States.

Therefore, it is absolutely vitally important that we not impair the most important electronic intelligence-gathering mechanism that the United States has to keep us safe. Oppose the Amash amendment.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill that does nothing to stop the unconstitutional collection of Americans' international communications without first obtaining a warrant, and it codifies the practice of indiscriminately sweeping up massive amounts of domestic communications.

What makes us different from those who would harm us is our commitment to our constitutional values: that we are innocent until proven guilty and that our government must obtain a warrant and show probable cause that there is a legitimate reason to listen in on our conversations.

This bill will further expose people to warrantless prosecutions or detention and deportation in cases that have absolutely no connection whatsoever to national security.

I hope we reject this bill, unless we approve the Amash-Lofgren amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have only one speaker remaining to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the House of Representatives for coming together on the floor of the House and in our various caucuses and conferences to discuss the important challenge that we all face: the balance that we have to protect the American people. That is the oath we take: to protect and defend. As we defend the Constitution, we defend the privacy and the civil liberties of the American people.

It is difficult.

Over 20 years ago, I was on the Intelligence Committee for the purpose of protecting civil liberties and privacy, and also to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, two really important overarching issues. So I come to the floor today as one who has worked on this issue for a very long time.

I thank our men and women in the intelligence community for the work they do. We are so proud of what they do.

In those days, almost 25 years ago, when I was first on the committee, it was about force protection and trying to have enough intelligence to avoid conflict, but if we were to engage, we would have the intelligence to protect our forces. It was about force protection. In the nineties, it became more about fighting terrorism and other overarching issues as well.

We live in a dangerous world and force protection on the ground, in theater, is still an essential part of what the intelligence community does. Again, I thank the men and women in the intelligence community for their patriotism and their courage.

The issue that relates to fighting terrorism is one that sometimes has a frightening manifestation on our own soil. But as we protect and defend the American people and the Constitution and their rights, we have to have that balance. It was Benjamin Franklin who said: If we don't fight for security and freedom, we won't have either.

I want to particularly thank our ranking member on the Intelligence Committee. He has made us all proud in going across the country to honor our Constitution, talking about undermining our election system, talking about protecting the American people in ways that is consistent with our Constitution. I thank Mr. SCHIFF and I support him today in his support of the bill that came from his committee.

Is it perfect?

I have never voted for a perfect bill in this House.

I also thank Mr. NADLER, a genius on all of these issues that relate to our Constitution. I also thank the members of the Judiciary Committee.

We have very few members on the Intelligence Committee who are deputized by the Speaker and by the leaders of each party to go to the Intelligence Committee to deal with issues that relate to the balance between security and privacy.

With all the respect in the world for the magnificent members of the Judiciary Committee, all of whom I respect, it is not right to say there is nothing in this bill that protects the privacy of the American people.

In fact, when I was supporting the Judiciary Committee bill, outside groups were complaining. They wanted the Zoe Lofgren amendment. They didn't want that bill. They were complaining about it. Now, today, they are saying that is what they want.

Studying the issue, I think one of the differences along the way is when it is appropriate in terms of a warrant. That is why I am so pleased that we will be offering a motion to recommit that addresses just that concern, which is what I am hearing about from folks.

The amendment, the motion to recommit, addresses concerns of people on both sides of the aisle, certainly in our Democratic Caucus, that seeks to secure the highest possible protections for American civil liberties. At the same time, it ensures that the intelligence community and law enforcement can continue to keep Americans safe.

This amendment would go a step further from the modified bill that is on the floor under consideration to ensure law enforcement secures a warrant before accessing Americans' information.

Let me repeat that. The amendment will go a step further than the modified bill under consideration to ensure law enforcement secures a warrant before accessing Americans' information.

Under this amendment, a court order would be required to access Americans' data in connection with any non-national security criminal investigation by the FBI.

This amendment removes predicate—that is the operational word—standards and it expands the universe of investigations that would require a warrant.

A vote for this amendment—and I hope it would be bipartisan, especially from those who are objecting to the bill on the floor—is a vote for privacy protections and for civil liberties. We would have preferred to have this in the original bill that is coming to the floor. We couldn't get that in committee. Hopefully, we can get it on the floor.

Voting against the motion to recommit means fewer protections, less oversight, and more risk that Americans' rights will be violated.

In the course of this, I mentioned this issue about the warrant and arrest. I talked about the Judiciary Committee's bill. At the offset of all of this, we all opposed the first Intelligence Committee's bill. We supported the Judiciary Committee's bipartisan bill being criticized by some outside groups for supporting it, rather than the Lofgren amendment.

But changes were made in the Intelligence Committee's bill to this effect. We asked the Speaker to take out the masking provisions, which have no place in this bill. The chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. NUNES, foolishly put that in this bill. It made it a complete nonstarter. I thank the Speaker for removing it.

By the way, somebody should tell the President because he thinks it is still in the bill. With that being said, I personally directed the unmasking process be fixed. It isn't fixed in the bill, Mr. President. That would be a second tweet of the day, confusing matters even worse, unfortunately. The administration, although they probably would like an extension of the status quo, understands we have to do more than that.

The other provision that was in the bill was an expansion of agents of foreign governments. Agents of foreign governments opened up more people who would be subjected to surveillance. We said: That doesn't fly. That has to be closed. The Speaker did that.

Then, on the ''abouts'' language, I think most people who understand that—it is a complicated issue—understand that it is really not a factor in this discussion. People don't want it mentioned, but the fact is that it had to be addressed. It is not being used and it is unconstitutional. Until it can be proven to be constitutional, it can't be used. When it is used, they would have to go to the FISA court to get permission, and then come to Congress for ratification of that. So there are many protections there.

It is hard, I know. I had a hard time when I was Speaker and we passed a bill to address the gross violations of Vice President Cheney doing the Bush-Cheney surveillance. It was appalling, in my view. I considered it unconstitutional, others did not. But, nonetheless, we put in many, many protections where there were none, and then renewed and improved them when we renewed the bill subsequently in its reauthorization.

□ 1015

This isn't about the other side of the aisle that is saying you don't care about privacy if you support this bill. It isn't about that. It is about where you strike the balance when you weigh the equities.

We have to come down in favor of honoring our Constitution and our civil liberties, but we cannot do that completely at the expense. And I believe that the Members and Mr. NADLER understand that full well, and I commend him for his deep understanding of the vital national security issues and the invaluable work that his committee has done to strike a balance between security and privacy and has made a difference.

But the choice we have today is to pass something that is—defeat this bill. Okay. You have done that, if you want to do that. Pass an amendment that won't go anyplace, you can do that, and we will be left with extension of the status quo of the current law.

As one who has participated in writing it those years ago, I understand its merit. I also understand the changes in technology, of tactics of terrorists who are out there, and that we have to improve the bill.

I don't consider it a reform bill. It is not that vast. It is some improvements in how we can collect, protect, again, keep the American people safe as well as protect their civil liberties.

Just a couple other things about it. Since this legislation was designed to address concerns related to the use of information collected under FISA section 702, an important foreign intelligence collection authority—we have to keep that emphasis on ''an important foreign intelligence authority.''

So, my colleagues, to that end, this modifies that it requires a court order based on probable cause for FBI criminal investigators to view Americans' communication in the section 702 database and mandates an inspector general study of 702 data. So let's keep the vigilance on, even as we go forward. It contains refined language related to ''abouts'' collection. It requires the executive branch to secure explicit approval from the FISA court for collection. It further objects ''abouts'' collections to—subjects a 30-day congressional review process. I know Mr. SENSENBRENNER said nobody can do anything in 30 days, but I think we can.

The bill strengthens the privacy and civil liberties oversight board. That was something I was instrumental in establishing when I was on the Intelligence Committee. I know it is important, but I also know that it has to be strengthened and it has to be respected as a watchdog.

So, I mean, the list goes on requiring public reporting on the use of 702 data, just saying to the intelligence community: Don't try to minimize any violations that may have occurred; we want the facts; we want the truth.

And that is why I am so glad it has expanded whistleblower protections and briefings to the Oversight Committee, which we have required. Unlike the original House Intelligence bill, which I oppose, this bill does not include language that would have likely expanded the universe of FISA targets who are now, as I mentioned before, agents of foreign policy powers. It excludes the language on unmasking; somebody tell the President.

It gives me great pride in our Caucus, if you could have heard the beautiful debate between Mr. NADLER and Mr.

SCHIFF on this subject. We are not that far apart. I think that the motion to recommit addresses most of the concerns we have been getting from the outside groups, and communities have dedicated their—whose organized purpose is to protect the civil liberties of the American people.

But, again, with great respect for everyone's opinions and whatever they have put forth, again, saluting our men and women in the intelligence community for the work that they do, we want to be sure we strengthen their hand in terms of protecting the national security of our country, which is our first responsibility, keep the American people safe, and, as we do so, to honor our oath of office to the Constitution, to honor the principles of the Constitution.

Our Founders knew full well the challenge between security and civil liberties. They lived in a world when they were under attack. The War of 1812 came very soon after the establishment of our country, so this was not a foreign idea to them, and they bequeathed to us the responsibility to protect, defend, protect our liberties.

And, again, respectful of this debate on this issue, I myself will be voting to support my ranking member on the Intelligence Committee, Mr. SCHIFF, our ranking member, and Members will follow their conscience on this. I just wanted you to know, from my experience in all of this and with weighing the equities involved, that that is the path that I will take.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Judiciary Committee, to close the debate on this side.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I also thank the minority leader for her remarks in support of 702.

I rise in support of the 702 reauthorization. It is critical to our national security. You would see the color drain out of the faces of all of our security personnel, the entire national security community, if we lost the ability and went dark on 702.

We have got to follow through in this Congress. We have got to provide the flexibility for them to use the tools that we have available to us, and we have set up procedures that will approve of this annually under the FISA courts. We have got a probable cause requirement for any criminal investigation. That protects U.S. persons. And we don't need to be protecting anything but U.S. persons when it comes to this.

The gentlewoman spoke of civil liberties, and I stand in defense of those civil liberties as well and in defense of the national security. We have got an IG report that is written into this bill.

But I would remind the people who are concerned about this focus on these civil liberties that Google and Facebook and Verizon and AT&T, they hold more data than the U.S. Government has. That is where the real information is, and if they are concerned about that, they should raise that issue.

Meanwhile, I am going to oppose the Amash amendment and support the reauthorization of 702. Our people in this America, U.S. persons, deserve that protection for national security reasons. I urge its adoption.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, strike line 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Uniting and Strengthening America by Reforming and Improving the Government's High-Tech Surveillance Act'' or the ''USA RIGHTS Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION ON PROHIBITION ON QUERYING OF COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS TO CONDUCT WARRANTLESS QUERIES FOR THE COMMUNICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PERSONS AND PERSONS INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

Section 702(b) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and indenting such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, an additional two ems from the left margin;

(2) by striking ''An acquisition'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An acquisition''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) CLARIFICATION ON PROHIBITION ON QUERYING OF COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PERSONS AND PERSONS INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), no officer or employee of the United States may conduct a query of information acquired under this section in an effort to find communications of or about a particular United States person or a person inside the United States.

''(B) CONCURRENT AUTHORIZATION AND EXCEPTION FOR EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a query for communications related to a particular United States person or person inside the United States if—

''(i) such United States person or person inside the United States is the subject of an order or emergency authorization authorizing electronic surveillance or physical search under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of this Act, or under title 18, United States Code, for the effective period of that order;

''(ii) the entity carrying out the query has a reasonable belief that the life or safety of such United States person or person inside the United States is threatened and the information is sought for the purpose of assisting that person;

''(iii) such United States person or person in the United States is a corporation; or

''(iv) such United States person or person inside the United States has consented to the query.

''(C) QUERIES OF FEDERATED DATA SETS AND MIXED DATA.—If an officer or employee of the United States conducts a query of a data set, or of federated data sets, that includes any information acquired under this section, the system shall be configured not to return such information unless the officer or employee enters a code or other information indicating that—

''(i) the person associated with the search term is not a United States person or person inside the United States; or

''(ii) if the person associated with the search term is a United States person or person inside the United States, one or more of the conditions of subparagraph (B) are satisfied.

''(D) MATTERS RELATING TO EMERGENCY QUERIES.—

''(i) TREATMENT OF DENIALS.—In the event that a query for communications related to a particular United States person or a person inside the United States is conducted pursuant to an emergency authorization authorizing electronic surveillance or a physical search described in subsection (B)(i) and the application for such emergency authorization is denied, or in any other case in which the query has been conducted and no order is issued approving the query—

''(I) no information obtained or evidence derived from such query may be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof; and

''(II) no information concerning any United States person acquired from such query may subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(ii) ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE.—The Attorney General shall assess compliance with the requirements under clause (i).''.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON REVERSE TARGETING UNDER CERTAIN AUTHORITIES OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a), as amended by section 2, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(B), as redesignated by section 2, by striking ''the purpose of such acquisition is to target'' and inserting ''a significant purpose of such acquisition is to acquire the communications of'';

(2) in subsection (d)(1)(A)—

(A) by striking ''ensure that'' and inserting the following: ''ensure—

''(i) that''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) that an application is filed under title I, if otherwise required, when a significant purpose of an acquisition authorized under subsection (a) is to acquire the communications of a particular, known person reasonably believed to be located in the United States; and'';

(3) in subsection (g)(2)(A)(i)(I)—

(A) by striking ''ensure that'' and inserting the following: ''ensure—

''(aa) that''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(bb) that an application is filed under title I, if otherwise required, when a significant purpose of an acquisition authorized under subsection (a) is to acquire the communications of a particular, known person reasonably believed to be located in the United States; and''; and

(4) in subsection (i)(2)(B)(i)—

(A) by striking ''ensure that'' and inserting the following: ''ensure—

''(I) that''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(II) that an application is filed under title I, if otherwise required, when a significant purpose of an acquisition authorized under subsection (a) is to acquire the communications of a particular, known person reasonably believed to be located in the United States; and''.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION, PURSUANT TO CERTAIN FISA AUTHORITIES TO TARGET CERTAIN PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES, OF COMMUNICATIONS THAT DO NOT INCLUDE PERSONS TARGETED UNDER SUCH AUTHORITIES.

Section 702(b)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as redesignated by section 2, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by section 2, by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (G); and

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

''(E) may not acquire a communication as to which no participant is a person who is targeted pursuant to the authorized acquisition;''.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF ENTIRELY DOMESTIC COMMUNICATIONS UNDER AUTHORITIES TO TARGET CERTAIN PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

Section 702(b)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as redesignated by section 2 and amended by section 4, is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (E), as added by section 4, the following:

''(F) may not acquire communications known to be entirely domestic; and''.

SEC. 6. LIMITATION ON USE OF INFORMATION OBTAINED UNDER CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1947 RELATING TO UNITED STATES PERSONS.

Section 706(a) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881e(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Information acquired'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Information acquired''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) LIMITATION ON USE IN CRIMINAL, CIVIL, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS.—No communication to or from, or information about, a person acquired under section 702 who is either a United States person or is located in the United States may be introduced as evidence against the person in any criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or used as part of any criminal, civil, or administrative investigation, except—

''(A) with the prior approval of the Attorney General; and

''(B) in a proceeding or investigation in which the information is directly related to and necessary to address a specific threat of—

''(i) terrorism (as defined in clauses (i) through (iii) of section 2332(g)(5)(B) of title 18, United States Code);

''(ii) espionage (as used in chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code);

''(iii) proliferation or use of a weapon of mass destruction (as defined in section 2332a(c) of title 18, United States Code);

''(iv) a cybersecurity threat from a foreign country;

''(v) incapacitation or destruction of critical infrastructure (as defined in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e))); or

''(vi) a threat to the armed forces of the United States or an ally of the United States or to other personnel of the United States Government or a government of an ally of the United States.''.

SEC. 7. REFORMS OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.

(a) INCLUSION OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES IN OVERSIGHT AUTHORITY OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—Section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by inserting ''and to conduct foreign intelligence activities'' after ''terrorism'' each place such term appears; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting ''and to conduct foreign intelligence activities'' after ''terrorism'' each place such term appears.

(b) SUBMISSION OF WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINTS TO THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(A) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

''(5) WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINTS.—

''(A) SUBMISSION TO BOARD.—An employee of, or contractor or detailee to, an element of the intelligence community may submit to the Board a complaint or information that such employee, contractor, or detailee believes relates to a privacy or civil liberties concern. The confidentiality provisions under section 2409(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, shall apply to a submission under this subparagraph. Any disclosure under this subparagraph shall be protected against discrimination under the procedures, burdens of proof, and remedies set forth in section 2409 of such title.

''(B) AUTHORITY OF BOARD.—The Board may take such action as the Board considers appropriate with respect to investigating a complaint or information submitted under subparagraph (A) or transmitting such complaint or information to any other Executive agency or the congressional intelligence committees.

''(C) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAWS.—The authority under subparagraph (A) of an employee, contractor, or detailee to submit to the Board a complaint or information shall be in addition to any other authority under another provision of law to submit a complaint or information. Any action taken under any other provision of law by the recipient of a complaint or information shall not preclude the Board from taking action relating to the same complaint or information.

''(D) RELATIONSHIP TO ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent—

''(i) any individual from submitting a complaint or information to any authorized recipient of the complaint or information; or

''(ii) the recipient of a complaint or information from taking independent action on the complaint or information.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(n) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'congressional intelligence committees' and 'intelligence community' have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).''.

(2) PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES.—Section 2302(b)(8)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''or to the Inspector of

an agency or another employee designated by the head of the agency to receive such disclosures'' and inserting ''the Inspector General of an agency, a supervisor in the employee's direct chain of command (up to and including the head of the employing agency), the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, or an employee designated by any of the aforementioned individuals for the purpose of receiving such disclosures''.

(c) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD SUBPOENA POWER.—Section 1061(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D), by striking ''submit a written request to the Attorney General of the United States that the Attorney General'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

(d) APPOINTMENT OF STAFF OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—Section 1061(j) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(j)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) APPOINTMENT IN ABSENCE OF CHAIRMAN.—If the position of chairman of the Board is vacant, during the period of the vacancy the Board, at the direction of the majority of the members of the Board, may exercise the authority of the chairman under paragraph (1).''.

(e) TENURE AND COMPENSATION OF PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee), as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is further amended—

(A) in subsection (h)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''full-time'' after ''4 additional''; and

(ii) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking '', except that'' and all that follows through the end and inserting a period;

(B) in subsection (i)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314'' and inserting ''level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''level IV of the Executive Schedule'' and all that follows through the end and inserting ''level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.''; and

(C) in subsection (j)(1), by striking ''level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316'' and inserting ''level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by paragraph (1)—

(i) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) except as provided in paragraph (2), shall apply to any appointment to a position as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

(i) COMPENSATION CHANGES.—The amendments made by subparagraphs (B)(i) and (C) of paragraph (1) shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) ELECTION TO SERVE FULL TIME BY INCUMBENTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—An individual serving as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board on the date of the enactment of this Act, including a member continuing to serve as a member under section 1061(h)(4)(B) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(h)(4)(B)), (referred to in this clause as a ''current member'') may make an election to—

(aa) serve as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board on a full-time basis and in accordance with section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee), as amended by this section; or

(bb) serve as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board on a part-time basis in accordance with such section 1061, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including the limitation on service after the expiration of the term of the member under subsection (h)(4)(B) of such section, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(II) ELECTION TO SERVE FULL TIME.—A current member making an election under subclause (I)(aa) shall begin serving as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board on a full-time basis on the first day of the first pay period beginning not less than 60 days after the date on which the current member makes such election.

(f) PROVISION OF INFORMATION ABOUT GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978 TO THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—The Attorney General shall fully inform the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board about any activities carried out by the Government under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), including by providing to the Board—

(1) copies of each detailed report submitted to a committee of Congress under such Act; and

(2) copies of each decision, order, and opinion of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review required to be included in the report under section 601(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1871(a)).

SEC. 8. IMPROVED ROLE IN OVERSIGHT OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE BY AMICI CURIAE APPOINTED BY COURTS UNDER FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) ROLE OF AMICI CURIAE GENERALLY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(i)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Any amicus curiae designated pursuant to this paragraph may raise any issue with the Court at any time.''.

(2) REFERRAL OF CASES FOR REVIEW.—Section 103(i) of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (10) as paragraphs (6) through (11), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) REFERRAL FOR REVIEW.—

''(A) REFERRAL TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT EN BANC.—If the court established under subsection (a) appoints an amicus curiae under paragraph (2)(A) to assist the Court in the consideration of any matter presented to the Court under this Act and the Court makes a decision with respect to such matter, the Court, in response to an application by the amicus curiae or any other individual designated under paragraph (1), may refer the decision to the Court en banc for review as the Court considers appropriate.

''(B) REFERRAL TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.—If the court established under subsection (a) appoints an amicus curiae under paragraph (2)(A) to assist the Court in the consideration of any matter presented to the Court under this Act and the Court makes a decision with respect to such matter, the Court, in response to an application by the amicus curiae or any other individual designated under paragraph (1) may refer the decision to the court established under subsection (b) for review as the Court considers appropriate.

''(C) REFERRAL TO SUPREME COURT.—If the Court of Review appoints an amicus curiae under paragraph (2) to assist the Court of Review in the review of any matter presented to the Court of Review under this Act or a question of law that may affect resolution of a matter in controversy and the Court of Review makes a decision with respect to such matter or question of law, the Court of Review, in response to an application by the amicus curiae or any other individual designated under paragraph (1) may refer the decision to the Supreme Court for review as the Court of Review considers appropriate.

''(D) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the end of each calendar year, the Court and the Court of Review shall each publish, on their respective websites, a report listing—

''(i) the number of applications for referral received by the Court or the Court of Review, as applicable, during the most recently concluded calendar year; and

''(ii) the number of such applications for referral that were granted by the Court or the Court of Review, as applicable, during such calendar year.''.

(3) ASSISTANCE.—Section 103(i)(6) of such Act, as redesignated, is further amended to read as follows:

''(6) ASSISTANCE.—Any individual designated pursuant to paragraph (1) may raise a legal or technical issue or any other issue with the Court or the Court of Review at any time. If an amicus curiae is appointed under paragraph (2)(A)—

''(A) the court shall notify all other amicus curiae designated under paragraph (1) of such appointment;

''(B) the appointed amicus curiae may request, either directly or through the court, the assistance of the other amici curiae designated under paragraph (1); and

''(C) all amici curiae designated under paragraph (1) may provide input to the court whether or not such input was formally requested by the court or the appointed amicus curiae.''.

(4) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—Section 103(i)(7) of such Act, as redesignated, is further amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking ''that the court'' and inserting the following: ''that—

''(I) the court''; and

(II) by striking ''and'' at the end and inserting the following: ''or

''(II) are cited by the Government in an application or case with respect to which an amicus curiae is assisting a court under this subsection;'';

(ii) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

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

''(ii) shall have access to an unredacted copy of each decision made by a court established under subsection (a) or (b) in which the court decides a question of law, notwithstanding whether the decision is classified; and'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''CLASSIFIED INFORMATION'' and inserting ''ACCESS TO INFORMATION''; and

(ii) by striking ''court may have access'' and inserting the following: ''court—

''(i) shall have access to unredacted copies of each opinion, order, transcript, pleading, or other document of the Court and the Court of Review; and

''(ii) may have access''.

(5) PUBLIC NOTICE AND RECEIPT OF BRIEFS FROM THIRD PARTIES.—Section 103(i) of such Act, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) PUBLIC NOTICE AND RECEIPT OF BRIEFS FROM THIRD PARTIES.—Whenever a court established under subsection (a) or (b) considers a novel question of law that can be considered without disclosing classified information, sources, or methods, the court shall, to the greatest extent practicable, consider such question in an open manner—

''(A) by publishing on its website each question of law that the court is considering; and

''(B) by accepting briefs from third parties relating to the question under consideration by the court.''.

(b) PARTICIPATION OF AMICI CURIAE IN OVERSIGHT OF AUTHORIZATIONS FOR TARGETING OF CERTAIN PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES OTHER THAN UNITED STATES PERSONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 702(i)(2) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1881a(i)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the indentation of the margin of such subclauses, as so redesignated, two ems to the right;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and adjusting the indentation of the margin of such clauses, as so redesignated, two ems to the right;

(C) by inserting before clause (i), as redesignated by subparagraph (B), the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) PARTICIPATION BY AMICI CURIAE.—In reviewing a certification under subparagraph (A)(i), the Court shall randomly select an amicus curiae designated under section 103(i) to assist with such review.''.

(2) SCHEDULE.—Section 702(i)(5)(A) of such Act is amended by striking ''at least 30 days prior to the expiration of such authorization'' and inserting ''such number of days before the expiration of such authorization as the Court considers necessary to comply with the requirements of paragraph (2)(B) or 30 days, whichever is greater''.

(c) PUBLIC NOTICE OF QUESTIONS OF LAW CERTIFIED FOR REVIEW.—Section 103(j) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1803(j)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Following'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Following''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) PUBLIC NOTICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), whenever a court established under subsection (a) certifies a question of law for review under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the court shall publish on its website—

''(i) a notice of the question of law to be reviewed; and

''(ii) briefs submitted by the parties, which may be redacted at the discretion of the court to protect sources, methods, and other classified information.

''(B) PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION, SOURCES, AND METHODS.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply to the greatest extent practicable, consistent with otherwise applicable law on the protection of classified information, sources, and methods.''.

SEC. 9. REFORMS TO THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.

(a) FISA COURT JUDGES.—

(1) NUMBER AND DESIGNATION OF JUDGES.—Section 103(a)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1)(A) There is a court which shall have jurisdiction to hear applications for and to grant orders approving electronic surveillance anywhere within the United States under the procedures set forth in this Act.

''(B)(i) The court established under subparagraph (A) shall consist of 13 judges, one of whom shall be designated from each judicial circuit (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit).

''(ii) The Chief Justice of the United States shall—

''(I) designate each judge of the court established under subparagraph (A) from the nominations made under subparagraph (C); and

''(II) make the name of each judge of such court available to the public.

''(C)(i) When a vacancy occurs in the position of a judge of the court established under subparagraph (A) from a judicial circuit, the chief judge of the circuit shall propose a district judge for a judicial district within the judicial circuit to be designated for that position.

''(ii) If the Chief Justice does not designate a district judge proposed under clause (i), the chief judge shall propose 2 other district judges for a judicial district within the judicial circuit to be designated for that position and the Chief Justice shall designate 1 such district judge to that position.

''(D) No judge of the court established under subparagraph (A) (except when sitting en banc under paragraph (2)) shall hear the same application for electronic surveillance under this Act which has been denied previously by another judge of such court.

''(E) If any judge of the court established under subparagraph (A) denies an application for an order authorizing electronic surveillance under this Act, such judge shall provide immediately for the record a written statement of each reason for the judge's decision and, on motion of the United States, the record shall be transmitted, under seal, to the court of review established in subsection (b).''.

(2) TENURE.—Section 103(d) of such Act is amended by striking ''redesignation,'' and all that follows through the end and inserting ''redesignation.''.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(A) INCUMBENTS.—A district judge designated to serve on the court established under subsection (a) of such section before the date of enactment of this Act may continue to serve in that position until the end of the term of the district judge under subsection (d) of such section, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) INITIAL APPOINTMENT AND TERM.—Notwithstanding any provision of such section, as amended by paragraphs (1) and (2), and not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief Justice of the United States shall—

(i) designate a district court judge who is serving in a judicial district within the District of Columbia circuit and proposed by the chief judge of such circuit to be a judge of the court established under section 103(a) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)) for an initial term of 7 years; and

(ii) designate a district court judge who is serving in a judicial district within the Federal circuit and proposed by the chief judge of such circuit to be a judge of such court for an initial term of 4 years.

(b) COURT OF REVIEW.—Section 103(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Chief Justice'' and inserting ''(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Chief Justice''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) The Chief Justice may designate a district court judge or circuit court judge to a position on the court established under paragraph (1) only if at least 5 associate justices approve the designation of such individual.''.

SEC. 10. STUDY AND REPORT ON DIVERSITY AND REPRESENTATION ON THE FISA COURT AND THE FISA COURT OF REVIEW.

(a) STUDY.—The Committee on Intercircuit Assignments of the Judicial Conference of the United States shall conduct a study on how to ensure judges are appointed to the court established under subsection (a) of section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803) and the court established under subsection (b) of such section in a manner that ensures such courts are diverse and representative.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Committee on Intercircuit Assignments shall submit to Congress a report on the study carried out under subsection (a).

SEC. 11. GROUNDS FOR DETERMINING INJURY IN FACT IN CIVIL ACTION RELATING TO SURVEILLANCE UNDER CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a), as amended by sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) CHALLENGES TO GOVERNMENT SURVEILLANCE.—

''(1) INJURY IN FACT.—In any claim in a civil action brought in a court of the United States relating to surveillance conducted under this section, the person asserting the claim has suffered an injury in fact if the person—

''(A) has a reasonable basis to believe that the person's communications will be acquired under this section; and

''(B) has taken objectively reasonable steps to avoid surveillance under this section.

''(2) REASONABLE BASIS.—A person shall be presumed to have demonstrated a reasonable basis to believe that the communications of the person will be acquired under this section if the profession of the person requires the person regularly to communicate foreign intelligence information with persons who—

''(A) are not United States persons; and

''(B) are located outside the United States.

''(3) OBJECTIVE STEPS.—A person shall be presumed to have taken objectively reasonable steps to avoid surveillance under this section if the person demonstrates that the steps were taken in reasonable response to rules of professional conduct or analogous professional rules.''.

SEC. 12. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF REQUIREMENT TO DECLASSIFY SIGNIFICANT DECISIONS OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT AND FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.

Section 602 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1872) shall apply with respect to decisions, orders, and opinions described in subsection (a) of such section that were issued on, before, or after the date of the enactment of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ensuring Effective Discipline Over Monitoring Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–23).

SEC. 13. CLARIFICATION REGARDING TREATMENT OF INFORMATION ACQUIRED UNDER FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) DERIVED DEFINED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(q) For the purposes of notification provisions of this Act, information or evidence is 'derived' from an electronic surveillance, physical search, use of a pen register or trap and trace device, production of tangible things, or acquisition under this Act when the Government would not have originally possessed the information or evidence but for that electronic surveillance, physical search, use of a pen register or trap and trace device, production of tangible things, or acquisition, and regardless of any claim that the information or evidence is attenuated from the surveillance or search, would inevitably have been discovered, or was subsequently reobtained through other means.''.

(2) POLICIES AND GUIDANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence shall publish the following:

(i) Policies concerning the application of subsection (q) of section 101 of such Act, as added by paragraph (1).

(ii) Guidance for all members of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)) and all Federal agencies with law enforcement responsibilities concerning the application of such subsection.

(B) MODIFICATIONS.—Whenever the Attorney General and the Director modify a policy or guidance published under subparagraph (A), the Attorney General and the Director shall publish such modifications.

(b) USE OF INFORMATION ACQUIRED UNDER TITLE VII.—Section 706 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1881e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking '', except for the purposes of subsection (j) of such section''; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) INFORMATION ACQUIRED UNDER SECTIONS 703–705.—Information acquired from an acquisition conducted under section 703, 704, or 705 shall be deemed to be information acquired from an electronic surveillance pursuant to title I for the purposes of section 106.''.

SEC. 14. LIMITATION ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE PROVIDERS UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Section 702(h)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(h)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and moving such clauses 2 ems to the right;

(2) by striking ''With respect to'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in carrying out''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) LIMITATIONS.—The Attorney General or the Director of National Intelligence may not request assistance from an electronic communication service provider under subparagraph (A) without demonstrating, to the satisfaction of the Court, that the assistance sought—

''(i) is necessary;

''(ii) is narrowly tailored to the surveillance at issue; and

''(iii) would not pose an undue burden on the electronic communication service provider or its customers who are not an intended target of the surveillance.

''(C) COMPLIANCE.—An electronic communication service provider is not obligated to comply with a directive to provide assistance under this paragraph unless—

''(i) such assistance is a manner or method that has been explicitly approved by the Court; and

''(ii) the Court issues an order, which has been delivered to the provider, explicitly describing the assistance to be furnished by the provider that has been approved by the Court.''.

SEC. 15. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES FOR PUBLIC REPORTING BY PERSONS SUBJECT TO NONDISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT ACCOMPANYING ORDER UNDER FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) MODIFICATION OF AGGREGATION BANDING.—Subsection (a) of section 604 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1874) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following:

''(1) A semiannual report that aggregates the number of orders, directives, or national security letters with which the person was required to comply into separate categories of—

''(A) the number of national security letters received, reported—

''(i) for the first 1000 national security letters received, in bands of 200 starting with 1–200; and

''(ii) for more than 1000 national security letters received, the precise number of national security letters received;

''(B) the number of customer selectors targeted by national security letters, reported—

''(i) for the first 1000 customer selectors targeted, in bands of 200 starting with 1–200; and

''(ii) for more than 1000 customer selectors targeted, the precise number of customer selectors targeted;

''(C) the number of orders or directives received, combined, under this Act for contents—

''(i) reported—

''(I) for the first 1000 orders and directives received, in bands of 200 starting with 1–200; and

''(II) for more than 1000 orders and directives received, the precise number of orders received; and

''(ii) disaggregated by whether the order or directive was issued under section 105, 402, 501, 702, 703, or 704;

''(D) the number of customer selectors targeted under orders or directives received, combined, under this Act for contents—

''(i) reported—

''(I) for the first 1000 customer selectors targeted, in bands of 200 starting with 1–200; and

''(II) for more than 1000 customer selectors targeted, the precise number of customer selectors targeted; and

''(ii) disaggregated by whether the order or directive was issued under section 105, 402, 501, 702, 703, or 704;

''(E) the number of orders or directives received under this Act for noncontents—

''(i) reported—

''(I) for the first 1000 orders or directives received, in bands of 200 starting with 1–200; and

''(II) for more than 1000 orders or directives received, the precise number of orders received; and

''(ii) disaggregated by whether the order or directive was issued under section 105, 402, 501, 702, 703, or 704; and

''(F) the number of customer selectors targeted under orders or directives under this Act for noncontents—

''(i) reported—

''(I) for the first 1000 customer selectors targeted, in bands of 200 starting with 1–200; and

''(II) for more than 1000 customer selectors targeted, the precise number of customer selectors targeted; and

''(ii) disaggregated by whether the order or directive was issued under section 105, 402, 501, 702, 703, or 704.''; and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

(b) ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES.—Such section is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (d) as subsections (c) through (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES.—A person who publicly reports information under subsection (a) may also publicly report the following information, relating to the previous 180 days, using a semiannual report that indicates whether the person was or was not required to comply with an order, directive, or national security letter issued under each of sections 105, 402, 501, 702, 703, and 704 and the provisions listed in section 603(e)(3).''.

SEC. 16. ANNUAL PUBLICATION OF STATISTICS ON NUMBER OF PERSONS TARGETED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES UNDER CERTAIN FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978 AUTHORITY.

Not less frequently than once each year, the Director of National Intelligence shall publish the following:

(1) A description of the subject matter of each of the certifications provided under subsection (g) of section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) in the last calendar year.

(2) Statistics revealing the number of persons targeted in the last calendar year under subsection (a) of such section, disaggregated by certification under which the person was targeted.

SEC. 17. REPEAL OF NONAPPLICABILITY TO FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Section 603(d)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1873(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''(A) FEDERAL BUREAU'' and all that follows through ''Paragraph (3)(B) of'' and inserting ''Paragraph (3)(B)''.

SEC. 18. PUBLICATION OF ESTIMATES REGARDING COMMUNICATIONS COLLECTED UNDER CERTAIN PROVISION OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall publish an estimate of—

(1) the number of United States persons whose communications are collected under section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a); or

(2) the number of communications collected under such section to which a party is a person inside the United States.

(b) IN CASE OF TECHNICAL IMPOSSIBILITY.—If the Director determines that publishing an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) is not technically possible—

(1) subsection (a) shall not apply; and

(2) the Director shall publish an assessment in unclassified form explaining such determination, but may submit a classified annex to the appropriate committees of Congress as necessary.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003));

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 19. FOUR-YEAR EXTENSION OF FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 403(b) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) (50 U.S.C. 1881–1881g note), by striking ''December 31, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2021''; and

(2) in paragraph (2) (18 U.S.C. 2511 note), in the material preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''December 31, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2021''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of section 404(b)(1) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261; 50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking ''DECEMBER 31, 2017'' and inserting ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2021''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 682, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Speaker, my amendment replaces the underlying bill with the USA RIGHTS Act. Like the base bill, under the USA RIGHTS Act, the government can still use section 702 for its purpose of surveilling foreigners overseas; and the government can continue to store, share, and access that data to investigate national security threats.

The key difference is, in USA RIGHTS, it has to do with the collection and use of innocent Americans' data, not foreign intelligence. This means the amendment cannot harm section 702 programs if, as the government says, they are designed solely for foreign intelligence rather than domestic surveillance on Americans.

We all want the intelligence community to be able to do its job, and I have offered the USA RIGHTS amendment to give them the tools to collect foreign intelligence while also protecting the Fourth Amendment.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

This amendment, plain and simple, would disable 702, our most important national security tool. If passed, any chance of reform through the underlying bill is dead on arrival in the United States Senate. We cannot risk 702 collection ending.

This Chamber cannot be complicit in allowing terrorists to fly under the radar if this amendment kills 702, and I sincerely urge you to oppose the Amash amendment and not lose the opportunity to successfully balance national security and civil liberties, which is what the underlying bill does.

We definitely need to have a move toward more protection of our Fourth Amendment rights, and a warrant requirement in domestic criminal cases and a requirement that if you are doing a national security investigation and you find that the information is useful in a criminal case and it is precluded from court are two major improvements to our 702 law that protect Americans' civil liberties.

This bill must be passed. It is absolutely essential for our protection. It surveys people outside of the United States who are not United States citizens. The fact that it collects incidental information about U.S. citizens should not be a prohibition on this effort. But if you apply this amendment, you are not going to be able to have our national intelligence officials looking at this information carefully, and they are going to have to, in many instances, get a warrant when they need to act because they think it is a national security concern. A warrant either will be unattainable or it will be in a circumstance where it is too late, and, in both instances, we cannot allow that.

This bill provides balance. That bill goes too far. The amendment goes too far. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we pass this amendment. The government conducts 702 searches and broadly defines foreign intelligence investigations that may have no nexus to national security, and we are using this database for just criminal investigations that are domestic.

When you say ''incidental collection,'' it sounds like it is not much. Well, the fact is it is a huge amount of data in its content. What this amendment says is: if you are going to search for the information of an American who has been collected in that database and it is not terrorism but domestic criminal investigation, get a warrant. Get a warrant. That is what the Fourth Amendment requires.

Now, I took exception to the comment that 702 would go dark. We know that this existing FISA order goes through April, so the 702 program is not going dark. We have time to do this right. We have time to make sure that the Fourth Amendment is adhered to in the reauthorization of 702. Put the ''foreign'' back in the FISA bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to emphasize how dismayed I am by the amount of disinformation being propagated by opponents of section 702. I have heard some things over the last couple of days, and I just wonder, how in the world can someone believe that.

Let me tell you why this amendment must be opposed. Under the USA RIGHTS Act, the intelligence community would not be able to query the name of the suspected terrorist supporter in the United States to see if he is in contact with terrorist recruiters. It would not be able to query the name of a person in the United States who has been suspiciously approaching U.S. Government employees with security clearances to determine if that person is part of a foreign espionage network.

We would not be able to query the name of a registered owner of a suspicious vehicle parked in front of the Washington Monument to see if that person is in contact with terrorist operatives overseas. We would not be able to query the name of a person in the aftermath of a mass casualty attack on the United States to see if he has terrorist connections, or as a follow on, if potential follow-on attacks are imminent.

We would not be able to query the name of a foreign national who travels to the United States to take flight training but doesn't care about learning how to land.

Individuals in this room who want to end section 702 know that they have an opportunity to do with their vote, but they would be putting troops and American lives at risk. And if that is okay with you, then go ahead and vote for the USA RIGHTS Act amendment, but I promise you, you will regret it when, some day, in this dangerous world we live in, we have to answer to our constituents for our votes here today.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, my amendment protects the rights of Americans consistent with the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

□ 1030

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about terrorism. We are talking about the protection of Americans and their information. All of the rhetoric and the fear tactics that this will destroy our ability to go after terrorists is wrong.

The USA RIGHTS Act is important to protect Americans. The other side talks about protecting Americans. Let's protect their Fourth Amendment rights. We can protect them against terrorists if we amend this legislation with the USA RIGHTS Act and protect their rights under the Fourth Amendment.

Every American's data is being seized by the Justice Department, the CIA, and the NSA. We have asked them how many times that has been queried. They will not tell us because the information is massive.

All we are saying under the USA RIGHTS Act is that, if you want to go into that information on Americans, get a warrant from a judge, not a query. You can't go search it. Get a warrant under the Fourth Amendment or stay out of that information and still go after terrorists under 702 and under FISA.

We need to have this amendment to make the bill better to protect Americans overseas and at home.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I respect and share the sponsor's commitment to privacy and civil liberties, but this amendment would go vastly beyond the legislation advanced by either the Intelligence Committee or the Judiciary Committee. It would prevent the intelligence community from querying lawfully collected 702 information, even in situations directly related to counterterrorism and national security. It would make section 702 a far less effective tool at a significant cost to the national security of the United States.

The amendment would require a probable cause warrant or its equivalent before the government can query lawfully collected 702 data in an effort to find communications concerning someone who may be a U.S. person or a foreign person located in the United States even when such person is communicating with foreign terrorists or intelligence targets.

Probable cause will be lacking in many, if not most, intelligence and counterterrorism contexts. In such situations, the USA RIGHTS Act would prevent the government from detecting and disrupting plots against Americans or identifying and preventing foreign espionage on our soil.

It would also require publication of information related to 702 certifications that would disclose the sources and methods of intelligence gathering, imperilling our ability to obtain foreign intelligence information. That, to me, poses an intolerably high risk.

Instead, the underlying bill strikes a far better compromise. In the underlying bill, a warrant would be required in most nonnational security and nonterrorism cases when there is an open investigation. In the absence of such a warrant, the bill provides that evidence that would be obtained would be excluded from use in court.

That seems, to me, a very sensible balance: requiring a warrant in most nonnational security and nonterrorism cases and providing, in the absence of such a warrant in an open investigation, that information or evidence would be barred from use in court.

That addresses the gravamen of the concern over this program that it could be used for fishing expeditions against ordinary Americans. This amendment, on the other hand, would largely cripple the program. Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I urge opposition to the amendment and support for the underlying bill.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, any responsible effort to authorize section 702 must pass three tests:

It must include a meaningful warrant requirement;

It must end the ''abouts'' collection until Congress says otherwise; and

It must not restrict the government's ability to collect intelligence on valid targets operating outside of the United States.

The underlying bill does not include a meaningful warrant requirement, and it does not end ''abouts'' collection.

The Amash-Lofgren amendment, on the other hand, passes all three tests:

It includes a warrant agreement that comports with the Fourth Amendment;

It puts an end to ''abouts'' collection; and

It leaves the core functionality of section 702 perfectly intact. It would be harder to use this authority to spy on United States citizens, but the government's ability to gather intelligence on suspected terrorists and others overseas will not be affected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and make a meaningful change to section 702.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the many sponsors of this amendment for their leadership in this important fight.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment being offered and in support of the underlying bill and the increased oversight in transparency it provides to the body of the intelligence community and the American public that it protects.

I thank the ranking member and also Chairman GOODLATTE for allowing me to have this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want Americans at home to know what this program is not. It is not a dragnet surveillance program; it is not a program that could ever be used to target Americans; and it is not an unchecked intelligence tool. In fact, it may be one of the most heavily overseen programs that we have. This bill strengthens that accountability.

As former ranking member of the Intelligence Committee and Representative of the district that is home to NSA, I have taken many of my colleagues in this Chamber on trips to NSA so that they can see firsthand how these programs work to protect Americans and also to protect our freedom and civil liberties.

This is not a debate on constitutionality. The Federal courts have affirmed that this program's current authorization and operation are legal and consistent with the Fourth Amendment. This body has voted several times with bipartisan majorities to reauthorize it.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, let me make this issue really simple for the American people: spying on foreigners without following the Constitution, that is okay; spying on Americans without following the Constitution, that is not okay.

The Fourth Amendment does not have an asterisk that says our intelligence agencies don't have to follow it. The Constitution applies to all of government. That is why I support the USA RIGHTS Act.

Support this amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment—I think it is in the wrong direction—and to support the underlying bill.

The bill, I think, strikes a balance. Americans cherish and strongly want us to protect their privacy. We all agree on that, and I think this bill threads the needle. The underlying bill protects our Fourth Amendment through the FISA process through this improved effort.

We know we live in a dangerous world. Terrorism is a constant threat that we all clearly understand. When we take our oath of office, we swear to protect and defend our Nation from all enemies, foreign and domestic. I believe this underlying bill does that with increased transparency.

Clearly, it is not perfect. We never vote on any perfect legislation. But this is an improved piece of legislation. The amendment is an overreach in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, when James Madison wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, one of his overriding concerns was to prevent any branch of the three in government from becoming too powerful. That is why he put the checks and balances in the Constitution, so that the other branches could oversee and make sure that a branch that was trying to push the edge of the envelope would not be able to succeed in that.

The warrant amendment that has been talked about quite a bit today during the debate really is not effective. It is nothing at all. It ends up putting James Madison's legacy into the trash bin of history, and it does not deserve to go there.

Yesterday, The Washington Post reported that FBI officials told aides of Mr. NADLER that, under the proposed bill—meaning the underlying bill—they anticipate rarely, if ever, needing permission from the FISC to review query results. So this warrant requirement of the supporters of the bill and the opponents of the amendment basically doesn't mean anything at all because the FBI told Mr. NADLER's aides that that was the case.

Now, we have a debate here today on whether to put the F back into the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. The F means ''foreign.'' That is why

the amendment should be adopted, or, if it fails, then the underlying bill should be defeated.

This is a time to stand up for the oath of office that every one of us took a year ago to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. The only way we can do that today is by supporting the Amash amendment and defeating the underlying bill.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 3¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment and support the underlying bill.

I served a year in Iraq, and every day we got foreign intelligence information to us. Why? Because it helped us prepare. It helped us plan. It helped us deter. It helped us save American lives—not only the lives of our troops in theater, but the lives of people at home.

I am all in favor of protecting American citizens and their privacy; do not get me wrong. I hope that, in the information we collected in theater, there were no Americans involved.

But guess what this amendment will do. It will virtually guarantee that terrorists are going to make sure that they have an American, complicit or otherwise, involved with every one of their communications, email, or through a phone call. Why? Because that protects them. That will protect terrorists.

That is what this amendment would do. That is why I oppose the amendment and stand in favor of the underlying bill.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, my amendment protects the rights of Americans consistent with the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Amash amendment and in strong opposition to the underlying bill.

As a former Army ranger, I know the importance of section 702 in defeating the enemies of our country. The foreign enemies of our country are not subject to the protections of our Constitution; American citizens, however, are.

The supporters of the underlying bill would have you believe that the only way to secure America is by ignoring the Fourth Amendment, and I strongly disagree. It is the data of American citizens that is at subject here. The Fourth Amendment does not change when communications shift from the Postal Service, also in the hands of the government, to a database. It should be protected by the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support of the Amash amendment.

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

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Congress has sometimes made the difficult job of the intelligence community harder by not providing adequate controls and oversight. We have created a vast Department of Homeland Security, a vast security sprawling intelligence network that results in the collection of data that my friend, Mr. POE, talked about. Yes, warrants can sometimes be inconvenient, but we have judged it as a small price to pay to protect Americans from government overreach.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, servicemembers in the combat zone depend on 702 to keep them safe. 702 must continue to gather information on foreign terrorists to keep us and servicemembers safe. However, Americans in uniform serve to preserve an ideal that the Constitution protects the rights of Americans.

The bill, unamended, enshrines in law the abuse of the Fourth Amendment rights of American citizens, and it just cannot happen. This is not only about criminal prosecution but about political persecution.

Mr. Speaker, that abuse and the associated persecution is unfolding on the front pages and on TV right before us today. Don't lower the bar any further. Vote to preserve the rights of American citizens. Vote for this amendment.

□ 1045

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the patron of this amendment for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have covered many things in the past year, to include tax policy, healthcare, helping eviscerate ISIS, but I would argue this is the most important moment in the time that I have been in this building.

Not only is the Fourth Amendment at stake, so, too, I would argue, are due process under the Fifth and Fourteenth.

We must stand strong for individual liberty and privacy. That is who we are as a nation. If we do not put the ''F'' back in FISA, it becomes ISA, and all eyes are on you.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this body cannot be afraid of the Constitution. It has been our guiding moral force for this Nation for all of our beginnings and our nows.

This amendment is truly an amendment that will protect and provide for the FBI to do its work and to protect our men and women around the world who are wearing the uniform unselfishly. But let me be very clear: all this amendment does, frankly, is provide a roadmap for the FBI to utilize when it is surveying and it is using the private data of Americans. All the amendment does is ask the FBI and the Attorney General, where there is probable cause, that such communication provide evidence of a crime; and, as well, if there is a foreign power or foreign agent, to be able to utilize a warrant, and that is the protection of the Fourth Amendment.

Uphold the Constitution. Vote for the Amash-Lofgren amendment and let's move forward on this legislation.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to whether the gentleman has additional speakers?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me pose a hypothetical about the Amash amendment. In the criminal world, if an FBI agent is told through a tip that someone has just purchased unusual amounts of fertilizer that could be used to make a bomb, the Amash amendment would prevent that FBI agent from looking at the FBI's databases to determine if the suspicious individual's email address or other identifier—not the content of the email, just the email address or identifier—is located in the 702 database.

What would the American people say if we hamper our law enforcement from protecting them? What would people of this country say if we had another Murrah Building blow up and the FBI couldn't look at even an email address?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill and the USA RIGHTS amendment present a stark choice.

The underlying bill allows the government to warrantlessly collect an astounding volume of Americans' communications, makes no material reforms to the collection and use of that data against Americans, and explicitly allows even more surveillance than the law currently permits.

In contrast, USA RIGHTS allows the government to conduct broad foreign surveillance and share intelligence throughout the relevant agencies, but it also adds protections to prevent the erosion of Americans' Fourth Amendment rights.

These are two very different options, Mr. Speaker, but for all of us who care about civil liberties, who believe the United States can protect itself without retiring the Fourth Amendment, and who believe Congress has an independent obligation to protect the Constitution, the choice is clear: support the USA RIGHTS amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first, I just want to say to all my colleagues that I respect the passionate views that are on display here. I think this has been a very passionate and interesting debate. What I would like to do is try and bring a little clarity to this debate.

I want to thank the minority leader for coming up and speaking against the Amash amendment and in favor of the underlying bipartisan amendment.

We, on a bipartisan basis, have been working with the Senate and the White House to get this right, to add even more privacy protections to the law, even more than the status quo, to add the warrant requirement that this underlying bill has.

Let me try and clear up some of the confusion. There has been wide reporting and discussion here in the House about parts of the FISA statute that affect citizens. It is a big law. It is a big statute with lots of pieces. Title I of the FISA law is what you see in the news that applies to U.S. citizens. That is not what we are talking about here. This is Title VII, section 702.

This is about foreign terrorists on foreign soil. That is what this is about. So let's clear up some of the confusion here. Let me give you two examples of what this program has done to keep our people safe, two declassified examples.

Number one, this program, in March of 2016, gave us the intelligence we needed to go after and kill ISIS' finance minister, because of the intelligence collected under this program, a foreign terrorist on foreign soil, the number two man at ISIS who was in line to become the next leader. This program helped us get the information to stop him.

I came here before 9/11. I remember hearing upon hearing in the 9/11 Commission about the old firewall. We were seeing what was going on overseas, terrorists like Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan were doing all these things, and we couldn't pass that information on to our authorities here in America. We had this firewall that prevented us from connecting the dots. That was the big phrase we used back then in the early 2000s.

If we pass the Amash amendment, we bring that firewall right back up. You pass the Amash amendment and defeat this underlying bill, we go back to those days where we are flying blind on protecting our country from terrorism.

Let me give Members an example. This program has not only stopped many attacks, but let me tell you about one: a plot in 2009 to blow up New York's subway system. This was used to understand what people were planning overseas and what they were trying to do here in America so that we could connect the dots and stop that particular terrorist attack.

That is why this has to be renewed. That is why, among many other reasons, section 702, a program designed to go after foreign terrorists on foreign soil, is so essential. If this Amash amendment passes, it kills the program.

If this underlying bill fails, there is one of two things that will happen. The status quo will be continued, meaning no additional privacy protections, no warrant requirement—status quo. That doesn't do anything to advance the concerns that have been voiced on the floor or, even worse, we go dark; 702 goes down. We don't know what the terrorists are up to. We can't send that information to our authorities to prevent terrorist attacks. The consequences are really high.

One of the most important things we are placed in charge to do is to make decisions, not based on TV, not based on internet, but based on facts, based on reality, and we are supposed to make those decisions to keep our country safe.

This strikes the balance that we must have between honoring and protecting privacy rights of U.S. citizens, honoring civil liberties, and making sure that we have the tools we need in this day and age of 21st century terrorism to keep our people safe. That is what this does. That is why I ask everyone, on a bipartisan basis, to vote ''no'' on the Amash amendment and to vote ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

A motion to commit, if ordered;

Passage of the bill, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4578.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 183, nays 233, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—183

Amash
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Biggs
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Budd
Burgess
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Comer
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Farenthold
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Harris
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Krishnamoorthi
Labrador
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norman
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Raskin
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NAYS—233

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Bera
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)

Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Delaney
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Dunn
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
McCarthy
McCaul
McEachin
McKinley
McSally
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poliquin
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (WI)
Schiff
Schneider
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—16

Adams
Babin
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Hanabusa
Huffman
Kind
McHenry
McNerney
Nolan
Pascrell
Rush
Scalise
Wilson (FL)

□ 1116

Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. THOMPSON of California, FRELINGHUYSEN, MARCHANT, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. WALZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. O'ROURKE, WELCH, and MEEKS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

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

Mr. HIMES. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Himes moves to commit S. 139 to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 4, line 3, strike ''predicated''.

Page 4, line 4, strike ''opened''.

Page 6, line 21, insert ''or'' after the semicolon.

Page 7, line 5, strike ''; or'' and all that follows through line 12 and insert a period.

Page 42, strike lines 15 through 19 (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly).

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, members of the Intelligence Committee, on which few of us have an opportunity to serve, lead very odd lives. Every single day, we descend in the bowels of this Capitol, four floors down. We surrender our iPhones, we surrender our BlackBerrys, and we go into windowless rooms where, on a daily basis, we hear about some of the most grotesque threats to American safety and interests that you can imagine: threats to American lives, threats to American interests, and threats to our very way of life.

We see, every day, how essential 702 authorities are. The intelligence that we gather under this authority is critical to our safety, our security, and our lives. It saves lives. This program cannot be interrupted, and, if it is, God forbid, we will have much to answer for.

Even if this motion fails, the base bill, to those of you with substantial civil liberties concerns—and I count myself amongst you—the base bill makes important and meaningful civil liberties improvements over the status quo.

I deeply appreciate the efforts of many in this Chamber that oppose this bill, the efforts that they have made. Each and every one of us swears an oath to protect and defend the Constitution, and no one should ever be criticized for working hard to make sure that that process is served; not Mr. NADLER, not Ms. LOFGREN, not Mr. AMASH, not Mr. POE.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent much of the last several days trying to improve this bill with respect to civil liberties. I presented amendments to the Rules Committee which were, sadly, not made in order.

But the fact is that these protections exist. There are strict processes and procedures in place at the FBI as to how exactly U.S.-person information can be queried and used. On top of that, the entire 702 program is reviewed by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, the PCLOB, and is subject to meaningful congressional oversight by each and every one of us.

To authorize this program each year, a Federal judge must find it has met all statutory requirements and is consistent with the Fourth Amendment. Mr. Speaker, three district courts and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals have deemed this program constitutional.

But, Mr. Speaker, no bill is perfect, and so the motion I offer would encompass all FBI matters—not just predicated investigations, but all FBI matters not related to national security—and require court orders founded on probable cause before the FBI could access U.S.-person information under 702.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical national security asset. It is as important as our best operator, as our best technology, as our most powerful weapons, and I appreciate the efforts that have been made to secure our civil liberties. This motion to commit pushes this bill slightly in that direction, building on the meaningful improvements to the status quo, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I will just be really brief today. I want to thank all of my colleagues. There are a lot of strong opinions on both sides of the aisle on this issue, and we have taken many steps at the House Intelligence Committee to take Members out to the agencies that are doing this work.

We have offered time for Members to come down to the SCIF to read all of the information because, at the end of the day, we all take the American people's constitutional liberties seriously. I think the robust debate that has occurred in this House over the last year on this issue, through many markups, through many committees, and then even today on the floor here in the House of Representatives, has been a tough fight because it is a tough issue.

But in closing, this really is a compromise. We worked with the House Judiciary Committee for many months. I can't thank Chairman GOODLATTE enough for all of his very difficult work in trying to find a compromise. At the same time, the House Intelligence Committee, we have worked to come to a compromise with the Democrats on the other side of the aisle.

So with all of that said, this is one of those days, if we get this bill passed, I think we can walk out of here proud that we all stood our ground for stances that we really believe in, but, at the end of the day, the House is going to work its will in a bipartisan manner.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 227, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

AYES—189

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

NOES—227

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

NOT VOTING—15

Adams
Babin
Carbajal
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Garrett
Griffith
Hanabusa
Kind
McHenry
McNerney
Nolan
Payne
Scalise
Wilson (FL)

□ 1132

Messrs. RUSH, GOTTHEIMER, and GONZALEZ of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 256, nays 164, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—256

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cheney
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Dunn
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McEachin
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poliquin
Posey
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (WI)
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—164

Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brat
Buck
Budd
Burgess
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garrett
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Harris
Hastings
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
Meadows
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norman
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Raskin
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Williams
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho

NOT VOTING—12

Adams
Babin
Carbajal
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Hanabusa
Kind
McHenry
McNerney
Nolan
Scalise
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1139

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTER TERRORIST NETWORK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4578) to authorize certain counter terrorist networks activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—410

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

NAYS—2

Amash
Massie

NOT VOTING—19

Adams
Aderholt
Babin
Buchanan
Calvert
Carbajal
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Gene
Grothman
Hanabusa
Kind
McHenry
McNerney
Nolan
Rooney, Thomas J.
Scalise
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1145

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 875. An act to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit a report on filing requirements under the Universal Service Fund programs.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4708) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4708

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 ''Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act''.

SEC. 2. ENHANCED DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY COORDINATION THROUGH THE BLUE CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 434. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN.

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'human trafficking' means an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Department a program, which shall be known as the 'Blue Campaign'. The Blue Campaign shall be headed by a Director, who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

''(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Blue Campaign shall be to unify and coordinate Department efforts to address human trafficking.

''(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary, working through the Director, shall, in accordance with subsection (e)—

''(1) issue Department-wide guidance to appropriate Department personnel;

''(2) develop training programs for such personnel;

''(3) coordinate departmental efforts, including training for such personnel; and

''(4) provide guidance and training on trauma-informed practices to ensure that human trafficking victims are afforded prompt access to victim support service providers, in addition to the assistance required under section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105), to address their immediate and long-term needs.

''(e) GUIDANCE AND TRAINING.—The Blue Campaign shall provide guidance and training to Department personnel and other Federal, State, tribal, and law enforcement personnel, as appropriate, regarding—

''(1) programs to help identify instances of human trafficking;

''(2) the types of information that should be collected and recorded in information technology systems utilized by the Department to help identify individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking;

''(3) systematic and routine information sharing within the Department and among Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies regarding—

''(A) individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking; and

''(B) patterns and practices of human trafficking;

''(4) techniques to identify suspected victims of trafficking along the United States border and at airport security checkpoints;

''(5) methods to be used by the Transportation Security Administration and personnel from other appropriate agencies to—

''(A) train employees of the Transportation Security Administration to identify suspected victims of trafficking; and

''(B) serve as a liaison and resource regarding human trafficking prevention to appropriate State, local, and private sector aviation workers and the traveling public;

''(6) utilizing resources, such as indicator cards, fact sheets, pamphlets, posters, brochures, and radio and television campaigns to—

''(A) educate partners and stakeholders; and

''(B) increase public awareness of human trafficking;

''(7) leveraging partnerships with State and local governmental, nongovernmental, and private sector organizations to raise public awareness of human trafficking; and

''(8) any other activities the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the Blue Campaign.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 433 the following new item:

''Sec. 434. Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign.''.

SEC. 3. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure, in accordance with the Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance required under section 434(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2 of this Act, the integration of information technology systems utilized within the Department to record and track information regarding individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking (as such term is defined in such section).

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) describes the status and effectiveness of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign under section 434 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2 of this Act; and

(2) provides a recommendation regarding the appropriate office within the Department of Homeland Security for the Blue Campaign.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated $819,000 to carry out section 434 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend and the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider two measures from the Financial Services Committee: first, H.R. 2954, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act, sponsored by Representative TOM EMMER. This bill would provide targeted regulatory relief to our local community banks and credit unions; second, H.R. 3326, the World Bank Accountability Act, sponsored by Representative ANDY BARR.

Mr. Speaker, next week, our Nation's Capital will also welcome tens of thousands of Americans to Washington for the annual March for Life. In conjunction, the House will vote on H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, sponsored by Representative MARSHA BLACKBURN. This bill simply states that doctors must provide medical care to any child born alive after a failed abortion.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are expected, including legislation to address government funding and other expiring priorities. I will be sure to inform all Members as soon as any additional items are added to our schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

I presume the CR, or continuing resolution, is anticipated, as the gentleman referenced. Is that accurate?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, we have been in discussions to try to get a budget agreement. We have hopes we can get that done this time. If we are able to get that budget agreement, we will need some time for the appropriators to do their work, so we would have a continuing resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that.

Will that continuing resolution be clean, from the gentleman's standpoint—that is to say, it will not include other items on it—or does the gentleman have any anticipation that other items might be included on that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am hoping he is asking this question so he will return and start voting for this. But in the past, that has been what we have done, the last two, and I don't see any change in what we are moving forward with now.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I had the opportunity to be at the White House with the President earlier this week. He and I are attempting to work on seeing if we can make sure that we protect our DREAMers. I think we saw a unanimous opinion in the White House among the 17 Republicans and 7 or 8 Democrats who were there that it ought to be done. I was pleased the President said that it ought to be done, and ought to be done quickly. I appreciate the gentleman's efforts on that score.

Obviously, we also need to do something with the Children's Health Insurance Program. We have talked about that before.

We need to do something with respect to the supplemental for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, as well as Florida and Texas. Obviously, we passed a supplemental here, and it did not pass in the Senate. Hopefully, the Senate will address that, and we can address it coming back across the aisle.

In addition, we are going to have to, as the gentleman referred to, establish caps. We still, at this late hour, late date, do not have a figure for the Appropriations Committee to use in terms of what they will mark their bills to. You mentioned it, but does the gentleman have any update or degree of confidence that will be done within the next few days?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the negotiations have been progressing further, as they have for the last month or so. I believe, as we both know, in the need of this funding for our military. I believe that the military should not be held hostage for any other issue.

So I believe we can get to a solution here, and I am hopeful that those who have been negotiating can find common ground in the next day or two so that we can move forward.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, nobody has any intention, of course, of holding the military hostage.

Secretary Mattis and his predecessors have all believed that a CR is damaging to the military's ability to move forward and plan. I would suggest to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, that it is equally damaging to the nondefense side of the budget. Administrators and secretaries cannot plan for what resources they will have a month out, 2 months out, or until September 30 and the end of the fiscal year. Reaching agreement is important on both sides of the budget.

In addition, I would respectfully hope that we can pursue the policy and agreement that we made and on which Speaker RYAN was a principal on your side of the aisle and Senator MURRAY was the principal on our side of the aisle and reached agreement on the parity of increase—not parity of expenditures, because we spend more on defense, but parity of increase. Mr. Speaker, I would hope we could pursue that. It would accelerate agreement on how we are going forward.

I know the gentleman is going to be working on both of those efforts. I appreciate that and look forward to working with him.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 2018, TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 2018

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, Friday, January 12, 2018, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL S. 139

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent 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 California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 98

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill S. 139, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following correction: Amend the long title so as to read: ''An Act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to improve foreign intelligence collection and the safeguards, accountability, and oversight of acquisitions of foreign intelligence, to extend title VII of such Act, and for other purposes.''.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as chairman of the Committee on the Budget:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 10, 2018.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, It has been my great honor to serve as Chairman of the Budget Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives. I am proud that we completed our work when the House passed the most conservative budget in two decades, with $203 billion in cuts to mandatory spending and paved the way for tax reform. While I do wish the Senate had adopted our resolution, I believe that we have begun to change the culture of excessive spending in Washington.

With the FY18 Budget and tax reform complete, I am now respectfully stepping down as Chair of the House Budget Committee, effective Thursday, January 11, 2018.

Last summer, I announced that I would run for Governor of Tennessee in 2018. I had previously forestalled that decision to devote myself to the duties of serving as Budget Committee Chair in 2017—an opportunity that I did not foresee, but one that I felt honored and committed to undertake to ensure this House Republican majority passed a bold, conservative and balanced budget.

I would like to thank President Trump and Vice President Pence for their support of our House budget and leading the way on tax reform. It has been an honor working closely with both of them this year. I am grateful to the people of the Sixth District for giving me the privilege of fighting on their behalf in Congress.

Sincerely,

DIANE BLACK,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Ethics:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 10, 2018.

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

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Thank you for the privilege of serving for the past 5 years on the House Ethics Committee. While few, if any, members seek this assignment, the collegiality of the members coupled with the

seriousness of the jurisdiction have made it an experience I will treasure.

When I became Chairperson of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform I knew I would not be able to keep all other committee assignments to include Judiciary, Intelligence and Ethics. Four committee assignments, including a Chairmanship, is a challenging workload.

I was happy to finish out the calendar year and conclude some matters then pending before the Committee.

Accordingly, I tender my resignation from the House Ethics Committee pending your designation of a replacement. Thank you again for this opportunity and thank you to my colleagues on the Committee for their hard work and friendship.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 685

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Jody B. Hice of Georgia.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Womack, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mrs. Mimi Walters of California.

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, ranked as follows on the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mrs. Black, after Mr. Womack.

Ms. FOXX (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPOTLIGHT ON RURAL AMERICA

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank President Trump for shining a big, beautiful spotlight on rural America.

My district has 17 rural counties, and for far too long, our hardworking farmers in these communities have felt forgotten by past Presidents. But thanks to the Trump administration's new policies and renewed support, that is no longer the case.

This week, President Trump highlighted rural America when he addressed the American Farm Bureau Federation's national convention, making him the first President to do so since George H.W. Bush in 1992.

In his address, President Trump pledged to work with Congress to pass the farm bill on time, critical legislation that supports our farmers. I am a proud member of the House Agriculture Committee, and we have already been hard at work crafting this year's legislation.

The President also signed an executive order expanding access to rural broadband. In today's world, broadband is not a luxury; it is critical and a necessity. My constituents need accessible, affordable rural broadband in their homes, schools, and businesses. It is critical for economic development.

President Trump is implementing concrete solutions to make a difference for my constituents in rural Georgia as well as Americans across this Nation. Together with the Trump administration and my colleagues in Congress, I will continue my hard work to ensure that rural America is never forgotten.

□ 1200

SUPPORTING TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS DESIGNATION FOR EL SALVADORANS

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

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak against this administration's choice to end the temporary protective status designation for El Salvador. Because of this disheartening and potentially dangerous decision, 200,000 people who have been legally living and working in the United States will be forced to go back to a country they don't know, a country that still hasn't fully recovered from the devastating earthquakes but is in the grips of widespread gang violence with one of the world's highest murder rates. These families have chosen to stay here.

In my district, the TPS recipients from El Salvador have become ingrained and embedded in our communities. They are longtime loyal employees; they have started families; they have started businesses; and yes, they pay taxes. If they are removed, our country would lose over $100 billion over the next decade, billions would be lost from Social Security and Medicare contributions, and employers would experience hundreds of millions in turnover costs.

Congress should right this wrong and pass the American Promise Act so that these TPS recipients can continue to work and live in our communities and contribute to our country.

VENEZUELA'S GROWING HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to a growing humanitarian crisis, one that is often forgotten in news around the world. Venezuela is suffering through a collapse of its economy and Venezuela's children are starving to death.

According to a recent media report, the number of cases of severe malnutrition has nearly tripled in the years since the economic collapse, and doctors believe that 2018 will be even worse.

The Venezuelan Government has taken pains to hide the impact that the collapse has had on its population and the role their own repressive policies have played, but the recent statistics tell the true story. From 2012 to 2015, the mortality rate of infants under 4 weeks old has increased tenfold.

In 2016, 11,446 children under the age of 1 year old have died, an increase of 30 percent. Families and children now dig through trash in the hopes of finding food. This is a crisis we cannot turn a blind eye to. We must work together to address it. I urge my colleagues to keep this at the forefront of our consideration.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ABOUT TAX BY HOLDING TAX TEACH

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise to set the record straight about the Trump-Republican tax scam recently signed into law.

Middle-income and working people in Georgia would see a minimal gain, and eventually they will see their taxes go up, while the richest 1 percent of Georgians will get an annual tax cut of $83,000.

In fact, Georgia millionaires could receive a cut of more than $130,000 a year. In fact, the Trump-Republican tax cut bestows 83 percent of the $5.5 trillion tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent who don't even need it, while blowing a $1.5 trillion hole in the Nation's debt.

That is obscene, and that is why I am holding a tax teach this Saturday in my district to communicate with my constituents about what this tax scam means to them, what it means for their families, and what it means for jobs and economic growth.

EXPRESSING DISAPPOINTMENT IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment in the Democratic Party and to express my concern for the safety and security of the American people.

It has become evident that Democratic leaders and the rest of their party are more interested in protecting illegal immigrants and foreign nationals than protecting American citizens and passing a budget to avoid a government shutdown.

As a government, we are charged with supporting the well-being and safety of all American citizens. In order to fulfill this responsibility, we must secure our borders, end chain migration, and mandate E-Verify as a national practice.

We don't need to promote the practice of rewarding illegal aliens by providing jobs and safe havens, but, rather, our obligation is to law-abiding American citizens.

We cannot take care of the rest of the world if we are unable to take care of America and its citizens first.

AFL–CIO 2018 MLK CONFERENCE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, I will join the AFL–CIO's 2018 MLK Conference dealing with civil and human rights. At that time, we will discuss the GOP tax scam that stops the labor movement in its tracks because 83 percent of the tax cuts goes to the wealthiest 1 percent and raises taxes on 86 million.

I invite my constituents to join me from 1 to 3 at the Hilton Americas, where we will be talking about the labor movement and the devastation of the GOP tax scam on the American people.

At the same time, I am glad that I live in a nation that welcomes those who want to serve coming from other countries and live up to the ideals of this country.

I want to pay tribute to Rose and Jose Escobar. Jose came to this country under TPS from El Salvador. It is important that this family not be broken up. Jose was unfairly deported and deserves humanitarian parole to come back to be with his loving wife, a citizen who works for the Texas Medical Center, and his two wonderful children.

TPS, again, is not violating or jeopardizing the American people's security. It is a reflection of our compassion, our humanity, and our respect for those who come to this Nation fleeing persecution and devastation. To send back Haitians, to send back El Salvadorans will be a terrible tragedy, and to send back our DREAMers will be worse. Let's work as Americans to make this country what it is, our greatest country in the world.

102ND ANNUAL PENNSYLVANIA FARM SHOW

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday I attended the 102nd Annual Pennsylvania Farm Show. It was great to speak to and see so many constituents there supporting and learning about our agriculture community.

The farm show is special to Pennsylvania. It is the Nation's largest indoor agricultural event. It showcases more than 12,000 competitive exhibits, more than half of which are animal exhibits. More than 1,000 exhibitors and competitors were from my congressional district, like Natalie Eberly, who was showing Polled Hereford beef cattle.

It is well known for its delicious food, which I enjoyed and which raises money for nonprofits that support our agriculture community. This farm show highlights just a sliver of the industry that employs nearly half a million people in Pennsylvania and contributes $185 billion to our economy each year.

Special thanks to Congressman G.T. THOMPSON, my colleague from Pennsylvania, who is vice chair of the ag committee who conducted a listening session with other members of the Pennsylvania delegation, as well as members of the ag committee. I was very pleased to welcome to Pennsylvania ROGER MARSHALL from Kansas and Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON. It was a great session with many members of the ag community from across Pennsylvania.

I also would like to thank Farm Show Executive Director Sharon Altland for once again putting on a fantastic show. I also thank PA Ag Secretary Redding and U.S. Department of Agriculture Under Secretary Greg Ibach for attending and participating in the listening session as well.

Once again, fabulous show. I look forward to attending again next year.

RECOGNIZING HEATHER RICHARDSON-BERGSMA

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize High Point native Heather Richardson-Bergsma for qualifying for the 2018 Winter Olympics in speed skating. Holding multiple world records, she will be competing for her first Olympic medal this year.

Heather's hunger for speed skating began at an early age. Growing up just a few minutes from our local High Point roller rink, Heather's talents were recognized by a local coach who suggested she start taking inline speed skating classes.

Although she was told she must wait a full year before she could compete, her passion and dedication for the sport did not waiver, and a year later she competed in her first race.

The Olympics mark crowning achievements in every Olympian's career. The many years, hours, minutes, and seconds they have devoted to training all come down to fulfilled dreams and broken records.

Heather's dedication, passion, and perseverance demonstrate the characteristics found in every great athlete. I am proud to recognize Heather today and I wish her the best of luck next month.

RECOGNIZING JAVASCOUTS ROBOTICS TEAM

(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 JavaScouts, a youth robotics team from my hometown of New Hartford, New York.

In December, the JavaScouts competed in the regional qualifier for the FIRST Tech Challenge at Sauquoit High School, where they qualified for the regional championship in New York.

The JavaScouts also received the FIRST Tech Challenge Inspire Award, which is presented to the team that judges feel acted as a positive role model to other teams and embraced the challenge of this program.

I would like to extend my congratulations to the JavaScouts team personally: Keegan Birt, Liam Evans, Kyle Grover, Ari Sprague, Kyle Tuttle, Jimi Wadnola, and Leon Zong.

I wish the JavaScouts continued success as they move forward to the regional championship. I take great pride and it is a great honor in representing these young constituents who place such an emphasis on determination, ingenuity, and education in achieving these many worthy goals.

CONGRESSIONAL APP CHALLENGE WINNERS

(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 of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the winning team for the 2017 Congressional App Challenge for the First District of Georgia: Cole Goldhill, Luca Dichiera, Joseph Kim, and Ryan Cranford.

Over the last 4 months, 190 Members of Congress hosted the Congressional App Challenge in their districts, where students compete to code original apps. 4,100 students participated, submitting over 1,000 original apps.

The winning team in Georgia's First Congressional District is from Richmond Hill Middle School and created the app, ''Wing Finder.'' This app enables individuals who enjoy viewing butterflies to find more information about those butterflies, comparing their wing colors to a database containing numerous facts about them.

I am proud of these students in Richmond Hill for doing such a great job coding and creating this app. Seeing what these students can achieve

through technology truly gives me great hope for the future of our country.

REGULATORY REFORM RESULTS IN 2017

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to address the House this afternoon.

Beginning in 2013, I began discussing how our economic recovery was subpar in comparison to post-World War II recoveries. That is, in part, due to, as I argued, the wet blanket of the avalanche of new regulatory costs imposed by the previous administration.

Since Congress has a poor track record of regularly enacting all of our appropriations bills, funding the government, and directing agency priorities, the administrative state, that unelected portion of our government, has expanded in authority and filled that void.

□ 1215

The House turned a corner this year, Mr. Speaker, by passing all 12 spending bills, fully vetted through our committees, prior to September 30, 2017. Sadly, only the first time since 2010. Further, it has been more than 21 years since Congress has passed all 12 funding bills and had them signed into law before the start of a new fiscal year.

Likewise, the Supreme Court, in their case, Chevron U.S.A. v. the Natural Resources Defense Council, back in 1984, set up a concept now referred to as the ''Chevron deference.'' This, too, has empowered the unelected, Big Government Washington authorities deferring to their authority, rather than the People's Congress. This has further emasculated the Article I powers of the Constitution. I disagree with this concept of Chevron deference. Before he died, Justice Scalia regretted his defense of Chevron deference and said that it, in fact, ''contravened separation of powers.''

This combination of the Chevron deference and the lack of the regular, predictable oversight and appointments have resulted in this wet blanket of a growing leviathan of a centralized Federal power, negating State authorities protected under the 10th Amendment and curbing freedom for our families and individuals.

Noted New York lawyer and author, Philip Howard, calls this ''The Rule of Nobody.'' In the 2014 book, Howard argues that our administrative state is wearing people out. The process is devoid of human judgment and common sense.

Many of us, in the Congress, are pushing back insisting, like in the VA Accountability Act, that—a shocking idea—bad employees should be fired and, through the public oversight of our committees or in my own Golden Fleece Awards, that we demand accountability of the personnel of the Federal Government and commonsense in the application of our policies.

Howard recalls the U.S. Open golf championship, back in 2011, out in Bethesda, Maryland, when county officials shut down a children's lemonade stand near the course because it didn't have a vendor's license, Mr. Speaker. This mindless, box-checking approach is not limited just to the beltway's Federal mandates.

So enters President Trump, our new President. Last year, I wrote then-President-elect Trump asking him to create a regulatory relief task force to address the overly burdensome regulations from our Federal agencies that, in my view, have hurt, over the past decade, our economic growth, our job growth, our productivity, and, hence, our wage growth.

In February of 2017, President Trump ordered Federal agencies to create a regulatory reform task force to identify rules within their agency that needed elimination or modification.

I rise today to recognize the improvements in the regulatory process in the past year and the significant reductions in cost to the economy, as a result, and I commend the new administration for seeking to continue this momentum into 2018, with the recent release of its regulatory plan and agenda for 2018.

As Phil Howard has demonstrated, and we experience daily, the Federal administrative state is lacking in accountability. It is not just vast and costly; it is unnecessarily intrusive into the everyday lives of hardworking Americans.

In Arkansas, we have seen agency regulations that have had devastating economic impacts on our farmers, small businesses, nonprofits, schools, colleges, universities, and State agencies.

President Trump set the proper tone for reining in this regulatory state by issuing an executive order, in the first 10 days of taking office, directing agencies to eliminate two existing regulations for each new one issued. Common sense.

In 2017, Federal agencies have withdrawn or delayed 1,579 planned regulatory actions, leading to over $8 billion in lifetime net cost savings.

In 2018, the Trump administration plans to raise the bar by issuing 448 deregulatory actions and 131 regulatory actions, a better than 3 to 1 ratio, resulting in more than $9 billion in lifetime costs savings for the economy.

This chart shows the annual cost of new regulations reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget every year, beginning in 2009. You can see the wet blanket that I described growing between 2009 and 2012. But you can see, in the last column, 2017, that there is actually a decline: a $570 million reduction in the cost of new regulations proposed by Washington.

During 2017, here in Congress, we have passed 13 congressional review acts, 11 of which President Trump signed into law this year. By repealing these 11 damaging, large rules, the economy will save some $10 billion over the next 20 years.

These savings and cuts put the control back in the hands of the American people and ensure more accountability and much-needed transparency to the rulemaking process is assured, while providing that local businesses, local farmers, and communities have relief.

Also, we are working with the administration to rightsize regulatory costs through the use of cost-benefit analysis and asserting our Article I oversight authority. Thus, Congress is working, through our committee process, also, to lower and remove the costs and burden of that wet blanket of an overburdened regulatory state.

Naturally, this cost benefit work must be done responsibly by balancing labor and capital, clean air and water, energy security, clean energy, future safe banks, and protected consumers. All that is the responsibility of our elected Members in the House and Senate and their oversight of the executive.

I commend President Trump for cutting the red tape in Washington and giving control back to our States, local communities, and hardworking taxpayers.

COPTIC RESOLUTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise, today, to discuss my recent resolution here in the House, H. Res. 673, which expresses concern over attacks on Coptic Christians in Egypt.

I had the opportunity to travel to Egypt last year. In the course of preparing for that trip, and during the trip, as well as after I returned back to the United States, I repeatedly heard about the plight of Coptic Christians in Egypt.

ISIS named the Copts their number one target, and we all know their brutal atrocities against them.

In Libya, back in 2015, ISIS beheaded 21 Coptic Christians, sending shock waves from that photo around the world.

Scores were killed in the bombings of St. Peter and St. Paul's Church in Cairo, in December 2016. Most recently, on December 29, 11 were shot and killed outside of Saint Menas Church in Helwan.

These are just a few of the atrocities carried out against Copts by terrorist groups like ISIS.

I had the opportunity to walk the halls of the St. Peter and St. Paul Cathedral. I reflected on the Gospel of Matthew, when Mary fled to Egypt with baby Jesus to save him from King Herod. The Copts are the Egyptians. In fact, the word ''Coptic'' in Greek means Egyptian.

But there in St. Peter and St. Paul's beautiful cathedral in Cairo, murdered by a coward, as women and children prayed, blood splattered on the walls

marked the horror and chaos of that place of worship and serenity.

Although Coptic Christians have repeatedly been victims of numerous attacks from terrorist groups and extremists, it has been most disturbing to me to learn of the attacks carried out against Copts and Christian churches that are carried out by their fellow Egyptians.

On December 22, 2017, just after Friday prayers, dozens of Egyptian Muslims assaulted a Coptic Christian church south of Cairo in an act that started out as a demonstration. While unsanctioned by the Egyptian Government, this church had been holding services for some 15 years.

According to reports, the individuals called for the church's demolition, destroyed its contents, and assaulted those worshipping inside. Based on similar attacks, it is unlikely, Mr. Speaker, that the Egyptian Government will hold those perpetrators accountable for this egregious action.

This is just the most recent example of the ongoing trend of assaults on Copts, their churches, and their property.

I believe that many of us in Congress were pleased to see Egyptian President el-Sisi join Coptic Pope Tawadros II in participating in last Saturday's Orthodox Christmas mass at the recently opened Nativity of Christ Cathedral in Egypt's new administrative capital east of Cairo.

President el-Sisi's words of tolerance and hope are appreciated by all those who respect peace for all those who live in Egypt and all who favor religious freedom across the globe.

However, while President el-Sisi spoke words of tolerance, there are, in my view, greater actions that both he and the Egyptian Government can take to protect the rights of Egyptian Christians seeking merely to raise their families, pursue their work, respect their leaders, and love their ancient nation.

For this reason, I introduced H. Res. 673 to urge continued progress in religious tolerance in this very important country. There are many constructive steps that will enhance tolerance, provide better security for Christians, and improve the education and opportunities for all Egyptians.

My colleagues and I offer this resolution because of our long friendship and partnership with Egypt. We are partners in regional peace efforts, regional economic growth, and in our mutual desire to defeat militant terrorist groups and nations and those who finance them.

President el-Sisi has set the right tone at the top level of his government, and I believe he has a respectful partnership with the leadership of the Copts and other Christians in Egypt.

But that respect and the resulting legal protections must be passed down to all levels of government and society because the streets, sadly, tell a different story.

The Egyptian people are a proud people with an extraordinary civilization, and I believe this is a great opportunity for Egypt to emphasize the importance that Copts can play in Egyptian society as full Egyptian citizens.

As Coptic Pope Tawadros II told me on my visit to Cairo, all Egyptians, Muslim and Christian, take their water from the Nile.

Egypt is an essential partner in the efforts toward a lasting peace between Israel and her neighbors and in the fight against terrorism and violent extremism.

President el-Sisi told me on two occasions how important counterterrorism is to the Egyptian Government. It is their number one concern, without any doubt, and I commend the President for his partnership with the United States, and especially with Israel, in the field of counterterrorism.

With ISIS carrying out two terrorist attacks last year in Egypt within a month of each, in November and December, that killed Muslims and Christians, the Egyptian Government's concerns about terrorism are legitimate and real.

However, in my view, I do not believe Egypt's march toward modernization and progress and focusing on counterterrorism should come at the cost of sacrificing advances in human rights, education, and religious freedom.

I urge swift consideration of my resolution by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and on the floor of the House so that we can continue to advance religious freedom and civil society with our partner, Egypt.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 875. An act to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit a report on filing requirements under the Universal Service Fund programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 12, 2018, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3678. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Financial Stability Oversight Council 2016 annual report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5322(a)(2)(N); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 112(a)(2)(N); (124 Stat. 1396); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3679. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received December 28, 2017, 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.

3680. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received December 28, 2017, 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.

3681. A letter from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's report to Congress on college credit card agreements, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1637(r)(3); Public Law 90-321, Sec. 127 (as amended by Public Law 111-24, Sec. 305(a)); (123 Stat. 1750); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3682. A letter from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's report to Congress on the impact of the Credit Card Accountability, Responsibility, and Disclosure Act of 2009, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1616(d); Public Law 111-24, Sec. 502(d); (123 Stat. 1756); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3683. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AE58) received January 4, 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.

3684. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's technical corrections — 18-Month Extension of Transition Period and Delay of Applicability Dates; Best Interest Contract Exemption (PTE 2016-01); Class Exemption for Principal Transactions in Certain Assets Between Investment Advice Fiduciaries and Employee Benefit Plans and IRAs (PTE 2016-02); Prohibited Transaction Exemption 84-24 for Certain Transactions Involving Insurance Agents and Brokers, Pension Consultants, Insurance Companies, and Investment Company Principal Underwriters (PTE 84-24); Correction [Application Number: D-11712; D-11713; D-11850] (ZRIN: 1210-ZA27) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3685. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement Age received January 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 Education and the Workforce.

3686. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Missing Participants (RIN: 1212-AB13) received January 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3687. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation

and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Rough Service Lamps and Vibration Service Lamps [EERE-2017-BT-STD-0057 received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3688. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-69, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3689. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification on discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3690. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification on discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3691. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a vacancy, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3692. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3693. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act Annual Report to Congress, 2017, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 20307(b); Public Law 99-410, Sec. 105(b) (as amended by Public Law 111-84, Sec. 587(2)); (123 Stat. 2333); to the Committee on House Administration.

3694. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period October 1, 2017, to December 31, 2017, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 115—89); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

3695. A letter from the Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Secretary's response to the Office of the Ombudsman's 2015 Annual Report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7385s-15(e)(1); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3161); (118 Stat. 2185); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3696. A letter from the Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflation Catch-Up Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts (RIN: 0510-AA04) received January 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3697. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Safety Zone; Delaware River, Pipeline Removal, Marcus Hook, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2017-1053] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3698. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Nanticoke River, Seaford, DE [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0162] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3699. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Reynolds Channel, Lawrence, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0048] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3700. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Atlantic Ocean, Ft. Lauderdale, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0552] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3701. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; City of Oswego Fireworks Display; Oswego River, Oswego, NY [Docket Number: USCG-2017-0990] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3702. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Twin Bridges, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0737; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ANM-12] received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3703. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Kaunakakai, HI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0295; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AWP-2] received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3704. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Stevens Point, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0143; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-5] received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3705. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of the Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Territory and Airspace of Somalia [Docket No.: FAA-2007-27602; Amdt. No.: 91-339A] (RIN: 2120-AL28) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3706. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the Prohibition Against Certain Flights in Specified Areas of the Sanaa (OYSC) Flight Information Region [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8672; Amdt. No.: 91-340A] (RIN: 2120-AL27) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3707. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31167; Amdt. No.: 3776] received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3708. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31166; Amdt. No.: 3775] received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3709. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR — GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1101; Product Identifier 2016-NM-030-AD; Amendment 39-19122; AD 2017-25-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3710. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1104; Product Identifier 2017-NM-153-AD; Amendment 39-19130; AD 2017-25-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3711. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0473; Product Identifier 2016-NM-195-AD; Amendment 39-19124; AD 2017-25-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3712. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Alexander Schleicher GmbH & Co. Segelflugzeugbau Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0911; Product Identifier 2017-CE-025-AD; Amendment 39-19121; AD 2017-25-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3713. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-

2017-0714; Product Identifier 2017-NM-042-AD; Amendment 39-19123; AD 2017-25-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3714. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Delaware River; Pipeline Removal [Docket Number: USCG-2017-1011] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3715. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Rehoboth Beach, DE [Docket Number: USCG-2017-1028] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3716. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lake Washington, Seattle, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0976] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3717. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a periodic report regarding progress made toward opening the United States Embassy in Jerusalem, covering the period from May 31, 2017, to the present, pursuant to Sec. 6 of the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995, Public Law 104-45; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 4043. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to reauthorize the whistleblower protection program, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115–510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1701. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government; with amendments (Rept. 115–511, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3737. A bill to provide for a study on the use of social media in security clearance investigations (Rept. 115–512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1532. A bill to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Poarch Band of Creek Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on House Administration discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1701 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HECK, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 4766. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit further extension of requirement to implement positive train control beyond December 31, 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 4767. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a grant program for jurisdictions with high rates of violent crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4768. A bill to require the President to develop a national strategy to combat the financial networks of transnational organized criminals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 4769. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase awareness about the treatment referral routing service of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 4770. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to permanently extend the moratorium on leasing in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 4771. A bill to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4772. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for clarification under the Medicare program about minimal self-adjustment for off-the-shelf orthotics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4773. A bill to require the Administrator for General Services to obtain an antivirus product to make available to Federal agencies in order to provide the product to individuals whose personally identifiable information may have been compromised; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NEAL, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 4774. A bill to prohibit oil and gas leasing on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of New England; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEYER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 4775. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4776. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program of partnerships for State and regional hospital preparedness to improve surge capacity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 4777. A bill to amend section 214(c)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the data reporting requirements relating to nonimmigrant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 4778. A bill to strengthen parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and 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. LEE (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4779. A bill to protect States and individuals in States that have laws which permit the use of cannabis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FASO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. BACON, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 4780. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make available an online tax calculator to estimate the change in an individual's income tax liability with respect to the amendments made by the Tax Cuts and

Jobs Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4781. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land to Custer County, South Dakota; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 4782. A bill to provide additional disaster recovery assistance for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Agriculture, Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Education and the Workforce, the Budget, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4783. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to improve the scheduling of appointments, the accountability of third party administrators, and payment to providers under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 4784. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide funding for American Health Benefit Exchanges navigator programs and outreach and promotional activities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NUNES:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 684. A resolution objecting to the United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/ES-10/19, which criticizes the United States' recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. FOXX:

H. Res. 685. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; which was considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GOMEZ (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MENG, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H. Res. 686. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Korean American Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H. Res. 687. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Federal, State, and local taxes, fees, regulations, and permitting policies should be coordinated and reconciled to maximize the benefits of broadband investment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 688. A resolution honoring Mark E. Miller for his distinguished public service and professional assistance to the United States Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H. Res. 689. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any infrastructure legislation that provides Federal funds to wireless broadband providers to promote wireless broadband deployment should prioritize funds for wireless broadband providers in States that have enacted streamlined siting requirements for small cells; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANCE:

H. Res. 690. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that no Federal funds granted, awarded, or loaned pursuant to any legislation, infrastructure-specific or otherwise, should be used to fund the construction, improvement, or acquisition of broadband facilities or service in areas where there is an existing broadband provider that meets certain minimum standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Res. 691. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any infrastructure legislation to promote broadband internet access or communications facilities deployment should treat all broadband and communications facilities in a competitively and technologically neutral manner; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 4768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 4769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 8.—The Congress shall have the Power to make all Laws which shall be Necessary and Proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 4770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 4771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commercie with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan:

H.R. 4772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution which states ''Congress shall have the power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof''

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 4775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 4777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 4778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 4779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 4780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4781.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 4782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ROSEN:

H.R. 4783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 200: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 219: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 559: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 667: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 848: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 850: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 1316: Mrs. BEATTY and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1419: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1456: Mrs. WALORSKI and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1606: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1626: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1676: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1683: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 2004: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2166: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2542: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2561: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DONOVAN, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2719: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2746: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2748: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 3034: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 3240: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3397: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3398: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 3444: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3547: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 3637: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3773: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3828: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3875: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3981: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 4007: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 4022: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 4044: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 4062: Mr. JONES and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 4097: Mr. WELCH and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 4207: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4215: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 4253: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4270: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 4318: Mr. GIANFORTE and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4320: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 4321: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 4392: Ms. ADAMS and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 4410: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 4424: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 4474: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4482: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 4509: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 4548: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 4631: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 4638: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 4657: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 4664: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 4666: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 4706: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 4712: Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 4725: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 4744: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4760: Mr. FLORES, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. BUCK.

H. Res. 673: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BARR, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. DONOVAN.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 2018 *No. 7*

Senate

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, in whose hand lies the destiny of people and nations, empower our lawmakers to do Your will on Earth even as it is done in Heaven. Make their lives reflect gratitude for Your merciful kindness and loving providence. Lord, break the bonds of any excessive self-sufficiency by showing them what they can accomplish with Your supernatural strength. Help them to be blessings and not burdens as they live a life with the gifts of enthusiasm and expectancy. As they live at full potential according to Your expectations, use them to glorify Your Name on the Earth.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The majority leader is recognized.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, anyone who has read the news lately will have come across some pretty remarkable headlines about the state of the U.S. economy.

On Tuesday, Gallup announced that at the close of 2017, Americans' optimism about the job market set a new record. The same day, the S&P 500 hit an all-time high. Last week, the New York Times ran a story about ''a wave of optimism [that] has swept over American business leaders.'' This optimism, the reporters continued, ''is beginning to translate into the sort of investments in new plants, equipment and factory upgrades that bolsters economic growth, spurs job creation—and may finally raise wages significantly''—raise wages significantly.

Markets are optimistic, manufacturers are optimistic, and workers are optimistic. Investment is ramping up, wages are growing, and unemployment is low. By all accounts, 2018 is off to a very bright start.

Of course, Washington is not the source of all this. The engine of American free enterprise is not here in the Nation's Capital, it is in the ingenuity, talent, and work ethic of workers and entrepreneurs all across our country.

Government does not create prosperity, the American people do, but the Federal Government can certainly get in the way. Draconian tax policy and runaway regulation make it more difficult for American workers to find jobs and get pay raises. It becomes harder to start new businesses, harder to expand and invest in existing businesses, and more tempting to send money and jobs overseas.

During the Obama years, that is precisely what happened. For 8 years, his administration seized every single opportunity it could find to increase taxes, pile on more regulations, and literally micromanage the lives of the American people. Many middle-class families, like the ones I represent in Kentucky, were drowning in all this.

Now all of that is changing. In 2017, a Republican President, Republican House, and Republican Senate brought back bedrock, free market principles: tax less, regulate less, micromanage less, and empower the American people to work hard and keep more of what they earn. And we are already seeing results.

The most significant accomplishment was the historic tax reform law the President signed into law just over 3 weeks ago. It hadn't been done in 30 years, but in 2017 Congress and the White House worked together to overhaul the Tax Code. We cut rates for families and businesses, expanded key deductions, closed wasteful loopholes, and repealed ObamaCare's individual mandate tax. We took a lot of money out of Washington's pocket and put it back in the pockets of middle-class families, who, after all, earned it in the first place.

Earlier in the year, we made major progress in rolling back the tangled web of Obama-era redtape using the Congressional Review Act. Congress repealed 15 major Federal regulations that were literally stifling American enterprise. This alone is expected to save employers up to $36 billion in compliance costs. This was in addition to the 860 obsolete rules the Trump administration revisited in 2017.

Small businesses and large companies are all benefitting from these victories, and so are their workers. Boeing has announced plans to invest $100 million in developing its workforce and another $100 million to enhance its facilities and its infrastructure. AT&T intends to invest a billion dollars in capital upgrades. Just this morning, Walmart announced it would raise starting wages for hourly associates, along with bonuses and an expansion of paid family leave. That is great news for more than 1 million people, including the nearly 30,000 people working at more than 100 Walmart stores across my home State of Kentucky. This is in addition to all of the other employers across the State who have already begun passing tax reform savings along to their employees.

What is true for nationwide employers is proving to be true on Main Streets across the country as well. In

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

New Jersey a family-owned car dealership is giving each of its full-time employees a $500 bonus and looking to create more jobs. In Florida, a family-owned cookie bakery is planning to immediately expense new equipment purchases, enabling them to develop specialized products and boost wages for their team. All told, more than 100 companies have announced intentions to deliver special bonuses, pay increases, or other benefits to employees as a result of tax reform. This in addition to the direct savings from tax cuts. Thanks to lower rates and bigger deductions, American workers will get to keep more of their paychecks.

These are just a few of the ways a growing economy can make life better for the American people. This is what happens when a Republican President and Republican majorities in Congress work to get Washington out of the way.

It is a shame that none of our Democratic colleagues in the House or the Senate—not one, not a single one—voted for tax reform—not a one. If they had their way, American businesses would not have had a 21st century tax code giving them a fairer fight with overseas competitors, American workers wouldn't have these bonuses and special benefits, and a typical family of four earning just over $70,000 wouldn't be on track to keep $2,000 more of their own money this year.

Fortunately, Republican majorities passed the bill anyway, and the American people are sure glad that we did.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we are inching ever closer to the government's spending deadline of January 19, when we will have to address a host of unresolved issues. We must lift the spending caps equally for defense and other domestic priorities, such as opioids, veterans, pensions. We must pass an aid package to give relief to disaster stricken areas of our country. We must pass the healthcare package that extends CHIP—children's health insurance—and community health centers.

Just this week, the CBO projected that CHIP will actually save the government money if it is extended for 10 years. We could ensure that kids continue to get quality health insurance for longer and save the government money if we extend it for 10 years. That is a no-brainer.

Of course, we must settle the fate of the Dreamers. A deal to pass DACA protection alongside a package of border security measures is finally within reach. As the immigration meeting at the White House showed, almost everyone in this body is interested in passing DACA protections into law.

Democrats are interested in effective, practical border security measures. We want what secures the border the most, not what sounds the best, not what was a political slogan in a campaign but what actually protects our border as drugs flow in and other things come across. We are working as hard as we can to find an agreement both sides can live with. The only folks who didn't get the memo were some House Republicans who continue to push hard-line immigration bills that are outside the scope of the negotiations. I am referring to Representative GOODLATTE's proposal, which is entirely counterproductive and completely unacceptable.

If Speaker RYAN is going to listen to the hard right in the House and coalesce behind Representative GOODLATTE's proposal on DACA, we will have no deal. Let the American people hear that. If Speaker RYAN is unable to resist Representative GOODLATTE's proposal—he has never been for Dream to begin with—we will have no deal.

If Speaker RYAN bends to the hard-right faction of his caucus—which is far away from what most Americans think; the hard right doesn't like Dreamers, and 70 percent of Americans do—and if they ask for immigration measures outside the scope of our negotiations, then so will we. Deal with chain migration outside of the scope of Dreamers? Let's deal with the 11 million who need a path to citizenship—a tough but fair path. We can play that game too. We can go beyond the confines of this deal, which has been Dreamers and border security, and then the whole thing won't happen.

There are people on my side who aren't going to want to make any compromises. I know that. There are people on both sides who won't want to make any compromises. As responsible leaders, we have to come to an agreement, and we can't make everybody happy. That is why we have a House and Senate. That is why we have legislators.

The whole reason we narrowed the scope of our negotiations is so that we could accomplish something for the Dreamers, rather than relitigating comprehensive immigration reform in such a compressed timeframe.

This body passed a very fine bill, in my opinion. It was really tough on the border. It was tough on benefits. It was tough on a path to citizenship. For the first time, for instance, green card holders had to learn English. That was in our bill that passed this body—led by Senator MCCAIN and myself and the Gang of 8—68 to 32. The House didn't dare take it up for the same reason they seem to have trouble today: The hard right said no immigration reform. And we are stuck. That hurts everybody.

I am sure my good friend is hearing from farmers in his State, as I hear from farmers in mine, and businesspeople. We have to tighten up our borders. We have to make sure we have a rational system of immigration. We can't assure that every person who wants to come here comes here. We all agree with that. But that is comprehensive immigration reform, because we also believe that the 11 million here should be given a difficult but fair path to citizenship. We can't start litigating all of that.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle say: I have to have this provision outside DACA and border security. They are hurting the cause of getting something done.

If we can reach an agreement by the end of this week or over the weekend, we can pass it into law as part of a global deal on the budget by next Friday. I believe that is still the best way to resolve the issue. I am hopeful we can get this done. Any later than that, we won't have time to do it by the 19th.

Let me assure my colleagues, accept the majority leader in good faith and the Speaker in good faith—their intention is to put a bill on the floor in February or March. We have heard that before, and it never happens. So we feel passionately that we should get this done—both tighten up the border and help the Dreamers. We have to do it as part of the must-pass bill, and that must-pass bill is this global spending deal.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now a word on the Russia investigation. Over the past weeks, several events have shaken my confidence that our Republican colleagues are committed to an independent investigation in Congress and at the FBI.

A rightwing smear campaign is being waged to discredit the investigation and the investigator. Absurd attacks have been launched on Special Counsel Mueller, one of the finest men that I think we have ever come across in this body. I remember when he was FBI Director; everyone loved him. He is a man of utmost integrity. A Republican Congressman went so far as to suggest his investigation was a ''coup'' when that Member spoke on the floor of the House.

Here in the Senate, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee—I have great respect for him; we are the only two Charles E's in the Senate—referred Christopher Steele to the FBI and recommended criminal charges, even though Mr. Steele was a whistleblower—something that our chairman of Judiciary has always protected. He came to the FBI with concerns that Donald Trump was subject to blackmail. Any American would worry about that. The chairman took that action

unilaterally—that is, asking for criminal charges—without consulting with or providing notice to the minority. Yet he still expressed outrage when the ranking member of his committee released a transcript of his committee's interview with the chairman of Fusion GPS even though that was what was in contention. There is a fundamental double standard here. You can't complain, Mr. Chairman of Judiciary, about our side doing things unilaterally if you do them unilaterally. We want to work in a bipartisan way.

I applaud my friend, the senior Senator from California, for releasing that transcript. It contained information that was crucial for the American people to read and understand in order to judge for themselves the allegations my friends across the aisle have made. You make a serious allegation against someone but say no one can see the information? That is not fair. That is not how we work here in America.

Now, in the Foreign Relations Committee, my friend Senator CARDIN was compelled to release a minority report about Russia's interference in foreign elections because the majority would not join him. Think about that. Senator CARDIN's report showed something we already know to be true—no one disputes that; well, maybe a few—that Russia maliciously and persistently interferes in elections around the globe and will not cease without unified and strong countermeasures.

Senator CARDIN's report is another compelling reason that the Senate act on election security legislation. Before we left for the holidays, Senators LANKFORD, KLOBUCHAR, HARRIS, and COLLINS introduced the Secure Elections Act. It is a good piece of legislation that would help shore up election security. Midterm elections are just around the corner, and, as Senator CARDIN's report tells us, Russia will no doubt endeavor to sow confusion and chaos into our democracy once again. That is what they do. That is what Putin likes to do. We have to stop it. And making information public about it is very important. This should be a unifying, nonpartisan issue.

Why would the Republican majority on the Foreign Relations Committee refuse to join that report? It is because—in my judgment, at least—for partisan reasons, Republicans in Congress and some in some parts of the media—the conservative parts of the media—have sought to undermine the Russia investigation in countless ways. They have hidden behind secrecy and innuendo to cast aspersions on the investigation and erect roadblocks in its path. Their goal, it seems, is to discredit the investigation so that ultimately they can discredit any findings that are detrimental to their party or their President.

President Trump makes the strategy manifest, clear as day, almost every day on his Twitter feed. Yesterday, he tweeted that the Russia investigation was ''the single greatest witch hunt in American history.'' That is a little self-centered. How about Salem? Those people were burned at the stake. And he wrote that ''Republicans should finally take control.'' That last line should send shivers down our spines, that ''Republicans should finally take control.''

From the very beginning, this investigation has been about an issue most sensitive to our national interests—interference in our elections, the wellspring and pride of our wonderful and great and grand democracy. If ever there were an issue that transcends party, this is it. Yet here is the President of the United States imploring his party to ''take control'' of the investigation. You never thought you would hear a President say something like this. Frankly, you never thought you would hear such silence from the other side of the aisle when he does, but that is where we are. Republican lawmakers ought to shout down that kind of appeal. We all must commit to the essential truth of the matter, which is that the investigation into Russian interference in our election must remain as bipartisan and as nonpartisan as possible. The interests of the Nation are at stake. All of us—all of us—must choose country over party.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS DAY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today is National Human Trafficking Awareness Day. Montana, like much of the United States, is suffering from the rise in human trafficking. I am grateful that Montana's attorney general, Tim Fox, has taken this issue head-on. In fact, Montana has had three times as many human trafficking cases in 2017 as we had in 2015—a threefold increase. Unfortunately, this number will likely continue to rise in the coming years, and online platforms are a driving force for it. Like so many things, the internet has tremendous power for good as well as for evil.

Having spent 12 years building a startup cloud computing business in my hometown of Bozeman—a business we grew to over 1,000 employees. We took the company public. This became a large, global business. I understand the power of the internet for good. But I also believe we must and can have better safeguards to protect our children, our families, and our neighbors from sex trafficking, while at the same time protecting innovation on the internet.

Unfortunately, a startup business—your business—has the potential to be used for terrible reasons without your awareness. Even more upsetting, it is also possible that online platforms do know that bad actors are using that platform and they do nothing about it. During my first hearing on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, we investigated one of these platforms: backpage.com.

Bad actors like backpage.com must be held accountable. That is why today, on Human Trafficking Awareness Day, I will be joining the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act. This act strips protections for platforms that knowingly assist, support, or facilitate sex trafficking. We must take steps now to stop human trafficking and protect vulnerable members of our community. The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act moves us closer to that goal.

I tip my hat and I am thankful to Senator PORTMAN for introducing this bill. I am thankful for the work of the Senate Commerce Committee to ensure that this legislation protects the millions of companies on the internet that are building our economy and creating high-paying jobs and doing so in good faith.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor for S. 1693, the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, I regained my previous held seat on the Senate Banking

Committee, a committee I served on from 2011 until the beginning of this Congress. While this committee sometimes flies under the radar for many Americans, the oversight it conducts and the issues it considers under its substantial jurisdiction are of great consequence to America and to the American people.

The owners and employees of banking institutions have experienced success when their communities experience success. What I am saying is, how we lend money matters to every kind of person every day. So what we have experienced across Kansas, in many instances, is difficulty and really hard times.

I want to talk about community. Community financial institutions are of great importance to the folks I represent in Kansas. What I want to do, in part, with my opportunity to serve on the Banking Committee is to make sure those financial institutions have a regulatory environment in which they can benefit their communities and benefit the citizens who live there.

Communities in Kansas are losing their hometown banks to consolidation and sales, and some of these banks that are moving in that direction have been family owned for generations. In order to better understand why these lenders are consolidating or selling, I have sought out the nature of this decline by speaking with financial leaders from across the country. The overwhelming response I received is that the costs associated with complying with new Federal regulations are simply too much to absorb in their business model.

In the aftermath of our country's significant financial downturn, a new regulatory framework was put in place to rein in those bad actors and punish bad behavior that led us down that path in 2007 and 2008. We have had more than 7 years to determine what the effects are of this new regulatory environment—Dodd-Frank—and what it has meant to our community banks and our community financial institutions. The most glaring aspect of these new regulations is the disproportionate burden placed upon those smaller institutions seeking to comply with their new responsibilities.

Rather than extending credit to best fit the needs of their customers, banks are exiting entire lines of business because the penalties for making a mistake far outweigh the economic benefits derived from extending a loan. I experienced this damaging news and reality during the Senate Banking Committee's consideration of legislation to reform the secondary mortgage markets in 2014. I was attempting to solicit feedback from Kansas lenders of the financial impact some of these proposed changes would have on their communities, and what I learned, unfortunately, was this: ''Jerry, we don't make home loans anymore.'' When pressed for a reason, they responded it just didn't make business sense for them to do that any longer due to the increased Federal regulators' crackdown on mortgage lending.

As a member of the Senate who cares deeply about rural America and the special way of life we enjoy in Kansas, this is a very damaging occurrence. If a community banker determines they can no longer extend credit to what would have otherwise been a creditworthy borrower because of the fear of making a mistake and the repercussions that follow, then they decide not to make the loan at all and not even to be in the business. What community would expect their financial institutions in their community to refuse to make a home loan? It is the American dream.

While community banks had been consolidating for a number of years due to shifting demographics and market conditions, we cannot nor should we attempt to discount the role the post-Dodd-Frank regulatory environment has played in the acceleration of the harming of our community banking structure.

I am not opposed to regulations, and neither are the community bankers working to serve their communities, but there has to be prioritization on the part of Congress to create an environment where local lenders can succeed because the success of these institutions means the success of their communities and the people who live there.

During the fall of 2015, I worked alongside a number of committee colleagues—both Republicans and Democrats—to see if we could bridge the divide and bring relief to our community lenders across the country. While these efforts did not then produce a result, these discussions demonstrated that the issues facing the financial service world need not be partisan, and they sowed the seeds for what has now resulted in legislation moving its way through the legislative process today.

I am happy to support S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act recently reported out of the Banking Committee on a bipartisan vote. Many of the provisions in this bill originated in legislation I have promoted since I came to the Senate, first as the Communities First Act, and most recently as the CLEAR Relief Act. While this legislation will not solve every issue that needs to be solved, it is meaningful progress that will make a difference.

It is Congress's responsibility to ensure that economic growth is not needlessly impeded, and it is our duty to ensure that economic opportunities flourish and that Americans have access to the tools necessary to pursue the American dream.

The Banking Committee can and will play an important role in providing these tools, and I feel fortunate to have the opportunity to lend the voice of Kansans to that effort. I look forward to working with the chairman, MIKE CRAPO, the Senator from Idaho, and the ranking member, SHERROD BROWN from Ohio, as we work together to make sure good things happen in Kansas and across the country.

Again, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Banking Committee and on the Senate floor to see that all Americans have the opportunity to have access to credit so we can continue to pursue growing economic opportunities for all Americans to keep the American dream alive and well.

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. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am here today with my colleague Senator CAPITO to talk about something that is getting a lot of attention but needs even more attention from this Congress, which is the opioid epidemic—the epidemic the President has rightly called a crisis, and he then turned to Congress and said: Find the money to solve the problem. We have been doing a substantial amount of that, but I think we see a clear desire here and in all of our States to find a better solution.

This is an issue that has hit every town in America, small and large, I believe. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, over 40,000 people died from an opioid overdose. This is a fraction of the people who had an opioid overdose. These are the people who died from an opioid overdose in 2016, 40,000 people; over 90 Americans every single day. It was a 28-percent increase over 2015 and a dramatic increase over where we were just 10 years before.

Opioid overdoses now surpass car accidents as the No. 1 accidental cause of death in the country. Both of our States and our surrounding States, I think almost every one of them, have had more overdose deaths in 2016—and an increased number, I think, in 2017—than car accident deaths. The Centers for Disease Control estimates the economic burden of this epidemic is almost $80 billion a year.

We have just gone through a tax discussion, an economic growth discussion. When we were talking about billions of dollars, seldom were we talking about $80 billion to do something with or to stop doing something with, but the economic cost of all of this—lost productivity, addiction, the crime related to that addiction—the CDC says $78.5 billion a year is now the cost.

We are both appropriators. The members of the Appropriations Committee have looked at this carefully. Our colleagues have had a chance to confront this issue in our committee head-on. We brought bills to the floor that have passed and made a big difference in a

short period of time. Over the past 2 years, not counting what we hope to do this year, the committee has increased opioid funding by over $900 million, nearly a 200-percent increase for the Department of Health and Human Services—more money for justice, more money for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This funding is focused on developing alternatives for pain management, giving our State, Federal, and local law enforcement partners the tools they need to combat opioid trafficking, ensuring first responders we are working to see that there are better ways to respond with opioid reversal.

One of the things we have seen recently is that opioids of all kinds are now laced with new drugs like fentanyl, and you don't even know what you are taking. Narcan, the former way to deal with this and still the most effective way to deal with this—you think you have dealt with a problem, and the dose is so strong, the same person in just a few minutes lapses back into another seizure, attack, that has often been fatal. Even though people are there and the traditional way to respond is there, it isn't enough for what is going on now.

One thing you would have to tell anybody doing this is, it is unlikely you have any real idea what you are putting into your system. What you think was a narcotic high the day before could easily kill you the next day. We have been looking for better ways to monitor programs so prescriptions in West Virginia and Missouri—they are both States where, in some counties, the number of prescriptions people have been walking into the pharmacist with are just ridiculous.

The committee that funds the Department of Health and Human Services—that is the committee we are both on—in the last 2 years, we have increased funding by 1,300 percent, $745 million—13 times more than we were spending just 2 years ago. We have given grants to States, in ways we haven't before, to look at specific State needs and ideas they have to deal with this and then share. We have looked at increasing Federal surveillance on how prescriptions are being written, how drug stores are becoming the conduit, and how many substances are coming through the mail to find new ways to determine whether this is reasonable in the area these drugs are going into. We have looked at ways to increase the tools necessary to communities and first responders. We are talking right now to the National Institutes of Health about what they can do on a number of fronts. One is to work with the pharmaceutical companies themselves to develop alternatives to the kind of pain management we have had.

Also, let me say on that front, we have gone through a period where doctors and hospitals were too often graded on whether people had any pain or not as opposed to whether they had pain they didn't understand, pain that was unacceptable. More and more people ought to be saying, as opposed to taking this potentially addictive drug, give me a dose that is not as addictive, and maybe I am still more achy than I would be otherwise, more pain than I would have otherwise, but I understand it and am aware of it, and I am not in some cloud of no pain but not much of anything else in terms of real quality of life.

We are looking at how we can work with these companies for pain management. I have talked to the pharmaceutical companies. I think it is time for them to step up, maybe in partnership with NIH, so there is some Federal money to encourage more private sector money to find alternatives that are less addictive and better understood, to find more effective and affordable ways to respond. Just the amount of money in the first responders' kits around the country, and local governments paying for the Narcan, the more expensive injectable treatment—we need to look for ways where that can be more available and in a way that local governments have a better way to deal with this.

This needs to be dealt with locally. The first responder is going to be a local person. If you are a fire department that also has first responders, your department is three times more likely to go on an overdose call than they are to go to a fire. That is where we are in this situation today.

In trying to figure out what the impact really is at home—as we all are trying to do—I had a meeting not too long ago with medical professionals, with State officials, with emergency responders, in Springfield, MO, to talk about how we deal with prevention, treatment, and recovery. We talked about the critical partnership between local, State, and Federal law enforcement and the dangers the first responders themselves face. Sometimes what people are putting into their system is so powerful and so addictive that walking into the room or touching the clothing becomes a potentially great danger for the person who is there to help you. I talked to doctors and hospitals about the challenges they face in prescribing less habit-forming pain medications and how patients are still not fully aware of the danger of dealing with pain if you overdo it as you are dealing with pain.

I talked to one person who talked about his daughter who had just gone to the dentist and got pain medicine and had no sense that the pain medicine could be addictive and she should stop taking it when it had done its job, whether or not it was when the last pill was gone.

Then, of course, there is a new issue of underprescribing. Nobody likes to go back to the pharmacy twice to get the same prescription they just got a few days ago, but giving people more pills than they need to take themselves or have them sit in the medicine cabinet doesn't make any sense.

In our State, there are large urban areas, but it also has a lot of small and remote communities and, frankly, rural communities have been hit particularly hard by this crisis. Certainly, West Virginia is a State that understands this. There has been no more vigorous advocate for funding and new ways to solve this problem than Senator CAPITO. I am glad to be here with her today as we talk about this issue.

I can assure the people we work for that this is a top priority. It has been a top priority for over 3 years now. The first 2 years showed dramatic increases in the willingness we had to deal with this and the breadth of how we deal with it, and that is one reason we need to move on and get this funding bill, which should have been done by October 1, done right now. As we get a new number to deal with, one of our priorities will be the opioid epidemic, and one of the leaders in that discussion will be the Senator from West Virginia, Mrs. CAPITO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senator BLUNT from the great State of Missouri for his leadership on this issue. He chairs the subcommittee that is very pivotal—the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services—and has moved forward so aggressively to up the funding in this area. We have the pedal to the metal now.

As he said, when we are moving and coming to a final spending bill, this has to be a top priority for us. It is absolutely critical. I am really pleased to be on the subcommittee, but I want to thank him for—I know he works diligently with NIH, which holds big promise. We are always looking for solutions. Can we treat ourselves out of this? Can we law enforce ourselves out of this? Can we prevent ourselves out of this? I think we can do all of those. We have to have a component of research that looks at the alternatives to pain medications and pain management.

The current bill we have looked at is $816 million for programs to combat opioid abuse issues, and that is a 440-percent increase from the previous year.

I am going to go through this. It might sound a little mundane and detail-oriented, but people say: That is great to ''up'' the amount of money that you are spending, but where are you really spending this money?

The Senator from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT, mentioned that it has to be done locally, and there is a lot of emphasis on where these dollars are going.

Some of them are going, of course, to the CDC, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, for prevention issues, which is critical, while $50 million is going to our community health centers. In States such as Alaska, West Virginia, and Missouri, community health centers are seeing hundreds of

thousands—millions—of people every day and many more who are dealing with mental health and substance abuse. SAMHSA oversees the mental health grants that go to our States, and there is $15 million for a new SAMHSA program for opioid prevention. We have our drug-free communities program, which works well in my State. It is a total grassroots-up, bottom-up, when you get everybody from your local county or public health and others in the room to try to solve this issue. Then again, there are some block grant programs to our community health centers along with the funding to NIH. This is a broad-based look at where the funding is going.

We have an opportunity here in the next several weeks to ''up'' that funding, to make sure that the national priority that we feel, as Senators from States that are highly affected, is reflected in our funding. I believe that with Senator BLUNT's leadership on the subcommittee and with other members on the subcommittee, that is something we are going to be doing.

I happen to chair the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, which appropriates the money for the high-intensity drug task forces. Our State has over 22 counties that are in that. Is that a branding that you really want—that you are a high-intensity drug trafficking area? Not really. What that does is coordinate Federal, State, and local resources to help meet the challenge and face what a difficult problem you have. I work with funding on that, with the drug-free communities, and also with the President's Office of National Drug Control Policy. We have done a lot, and we have pushed for resources.

The Senator mentioned resources for our first responders. He mentioned how dangerous it is. There have been local stories about our first responders who have just touched fentanyl—just touched it—and have gone into overdose situations. We were at the White House yesterday and were talking, and the President mentioned drug-sniffing dogs that have had reactions to fentanyl. So this is a very lethal substance. Actually, I saw in the statistics for West Virginia that more of the recent overdose deaths are attributable to fentanyl than to heroin itself, and that is rising. We need the money for enforcement, prevention, treatment and recovery, and more resources for research, and I have mentioned how critical that research will be.

Nationwide, we had over 63,000 drug overdose deaths in 2016, and a number of these were attributed to heroin and fentanyl. In my State of West Virginia, we had the highest deaths per 100,000 for overdoses. I would like to say it is happening somewhere in which maybe we would have predicted that it would happen, but it is happening everywhere. It is happening to the children of friends of mine.

Ryan Brown, a young man in West Virginia, lost his life. He had a loving home, loving parents, and had been through treatment. He just couldn't fight it. He went back and injected himself with a lethal dose. He died in a very public place too. It was very tragic. To his credit, his parents have taken up the mantle for Ryan to try to get more treatment centers in the State of West Virginia. I thank them for that.

We were just at the White House—Republicans and Democrats—for the President to sign the INTERDICT Act. I sponsored that bill with Senator RUBIO, Senator MARKEY, and Senator BROWN. What it does is help give our Customs and Border Patrol folks the ability to detect fentanyl when it is coming in. We know it is coming in from across our borders, principally from China, maybe China through Mexico. We need to equip our Border Patrol agents to be able to stop that—interdict the flow of that lethal substance.

Just this week, The Hill newspaper published an op-ed about the Martinsburg Initiative. Martinsburg is in West Virginia, in the Eastern Panhandle. Everybody needs to visit Martinsburg. They have an innovative police-school-community partnership that is spearheaded by the Martinsburg Police Department, the Berkeley County Schools, and Shepherd University, along with the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA. This is a comprehensive strategy of intervention and treatment for families to help prevent the beginning of the addiction to opioids.

In December, I attended the kickoff of the Bridge of Hope Fund, and I want to highlight what some of the local communities are doing in my State to try to get a comprehensive spectrum of solutions. This is a new scholarship program that was developed by Fruth Pharmacy, which is a locally-owned, family-owned pharmacy, that will allow people who have completed addiction recovery programs to get a jump-start on their college educations and career training.

The founders of the program started it because they wanted to encourage people who have reclaimed their lives and been successful to be able to get back into the mainstream. We know one of the roadblocks to recovery is getting back into the work environment—to be able to get a job. Many of these young folks who are in this position have already burned through their education grants and their availability of Pell grants. So this Bridge of Hope scholarship is an organic, from-the-ground-up scholarship program for those who have been through treatment.

We had a young man who talked about his road to recovery and how important getting his education and getting back on his feet was. We need more everywhere. I think that is essential to all of us. We have to prioritize our Federal funding for States like mine that have been the hardest hit by the opioid epidemic.

I see my colleague from New Hampshire here. Both of us have joined together on the Targeted Opioid Formula Act so that those of us who have high statistics and greater need are able to have those funds more squarely targeted toward us for prevention and treatment.

There are a lot of good ideas out there. There are a lot of things going on, but there is a lot of tragedy around all of us. I would say to the folks in the gallery and certainly to everybody on the floor that you probably know a family or you probably know a community or you probably know somebody who has been hard hit by this. It is absolutely crushingly sad, heartbreaking, because it is preventable. It is something on which we can have an impact. If we don't, we are going to lose another generation.

I have great fears that we are going to look back on this moment in time and think we didn't do enough. So I think, with Senator BLUNT's help and the help of others, particularly with Senator BLUNT's chairing the Appropriations Committee, this is the direction in which we need to go. We need to have more targeted funding so those local resources can be creative in order to stop the scourge, to handle the scourge, and to educate the next generation as to how devastating this could be if one were to ever begin to go down this road.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, let me applaud my colleague from West Virginia, Senator CAPITO, for her work in addressing the opioid epidemic. It is something that I know, in a bipartisan way, we care about in this Chamber, and it is one place in which I think we could come to some agreement about increasing resources as we come to an agreement on the budget for the upcoming year. So I thank the Senator for her comments.

SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, AND FBI

Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning because I believe the United States is a nation of laws. The bedrock of our democracy is the rule of law. We are blessed with a judicial system and Federal law enforcement agencies that are respected worldwide for their integrity, impartiality, and professional excellence.

As the lead Democrat on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, I have a responsibility, along with my chairman, Senator SHELBY, and our colleagues, to ensure that the Department of Justice, including Federal law enforcement agencies and Federal prosecutors, have the resources they need to do their jobs. I also have a responsibility to ensure that they are independent and shielded from political interference.

On that score, I am deeply troubled by a rising chorus of partisan attacks on the integrity of the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and in particular Special Counsel Robert Mueller, who is investigating Russian interference in the 2016 election.

Actually, this is the cover of the report from our intelligence agencies on that interference in the 2016 election.

I believe these attacks against Special Counsel Mueller are part of a broader campaign, orchestrated by the White House, to undermine the investigations into Russia's interference in the 2016 campaign, including the possible collusion by the Trump campaign. This effort to discredit the investigation has profound national security implications for the United States.

Yesterday, Senator BEN CARDIN, the top Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, released a report on behalf of the minority of the Foreign Relations Committee that documents Russian President Vladimir Putin's two-decade assault on democratic institutions, Western values, and the rule of law. This report complements a finding by the U.S. intelligence community that was issued last January that Russia interfered in the 2016 election and will continue to interfere in our elections if it is not deterred. This was the unanimous conclusion of all 17 U.S. intelligence agencies. Yet President Trump continues to be dismissive of claims that Russia interfered.

This is not about partisanship. This is not about who won the election. This is about whether Russia is trying to disrupt our democracy. President Trump's comments about what happened here are an extraordinary abdication of the President's duty to defend our country and safeguard our democracy.

Our Foreign Relations Committee's report concludes: ''Never before in American history has so clear a threat to national security been so clearly ignored by a U.S. president, and without a strong U.S. response, institutions and elections here and throughout Europe will remain vulnerable to the Kremlin's aggressive and sophisticated malign influence operations.''

Meanwhile, the campaign by the White House and certain Republicans in Congress to discredit and deflect the investigation continues. Indeed, it is a campaign that has become even more bizarre. Republicans on the Judiciary Committee refuse to release testimony by the cofounder of Fusion GPS—testimony regarding Russian efforts to collude with the Trump campaign. Last week, Senator GRASSLEY and Senator GRAHAM took the unprecedented step of calling on the Justice Department to investigate former British MI6 intelligence officer Christopher Steele, the author of the Fusion GPS report. Think about that. Instead of calling for an investigation of the serious charges in the so-called ''Russia dossier,'' these Senators are demanding an investigation of the author of the report. Meanwhile, the President is becoming increasingly aggressive in attacking the investigations. Yesterday, he again called them a ''witch-hunt'' and demanded ''Republicans should finally take control.''

The partisan attacks on Special Counsel Robert Mueller are especially shameful. A decorated marine Vietnam veteran, he is a Republican who was nominated to be FBI Director by President George W. Bush and was approved by the Senate, at that time, 98 to 0. In 2011, when his 10-year term was up, President Obama, a Democratic President, asked the Senate to extend his term for an additional 2 years. Director Mueller was confirmed for another 2-year term by a unanimous vote of 100 to 0.

When Mr. Mueller was appointed special counsel in May, he was greeted with bipartisan praise for his integrity and professionalism. Here are some of the quotes we heard at the time.

Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said:

I have a lot of confidence in Bob Mueller. I think it was a good choice.

Senator RUBIO said:

I believe [Mueller] is going to conduct a full and fair and thorough investigation that we should have confidence in.

Senator ISAKSON said:

[Mueller's] been appointed for a purpose. Let him carry that purpose out, and let the evidence take us where it may.

Yet today, in the wake of indictments of key Trump campaign officials, some Republicans in Congress are joining with voices in the conservative media in smearing Robert Mueller as ''corrupt'' and ''dishonest.'' Those are quotes.

In early December, former House Speaker Newt Gingrich said:

Mueller is corrupt. The senior FBI is corrupt. The system is corrupt.

The day after Christmas, a prominent House Republican called for top officials in the Department of Justice and FBI to be ''purged.''

It is unfortunate that many Republicans appear to believe that in order to support the President they must attack and discredit not only Special Counsel Mueller but also the career employees of the Department of Justice and the FBI. These partisan attacks are baseless and reckless. They are undermining trust and confidence in the rule of law, and this must not be tolerated. It is time for responsible Senators on both sides of the aisle to speak up in defense of these institutions that are at the heart of our democracy. It is time to come together on a bipartisan basis to demand that Mr. Mueller be allowed to follow the facts wherever they may lead.

The FBI is also under attack. President Trump has said that the agency's reputation is in ''tatters'' and its standing is the ''worst in history.'' The truth is that the FBI continues to be the gold standard for law enforcement agencies worldwide.

The prosecutors in the Department of Justice are superb professionals who adhere to a strict ethic of honesty and impartiality, as do the nearly 37,000 employees of the FBI. They put their lives on the line every day to protect the American people from violent criminals, terrorists, and foreign agents who mean our country great harm.

Just last month, as the agency was being attacked on FOX News as equivalent to the Soviet-era KGB, undercover FBI agents were hard at work stopping an ISIS supporter who was planning a Christmas Day terrorist attack on Pier 39, the iconic San Francisco tourist attraction. This is just one example of more than 720 potential acts of terrorism that were disrupted and prevented by hard-working FBI agents last year. We can see the headlines from some of those plots that were thwarted in New York, San Francisco, Florida, and Oklahoma City.

On June 13, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee. Because the Attorney General has recused himself, Mr. Rosenstein is the top DOJ official overseeing the special counsel. At the hearing, I asked him if he had any evidence of good cause for firing Special Counsel Mueller. He answered: ''No, I have not.'' In response to my further questioning, Mr. Rosenstein responded: ''You have my assurance that we are [going to] faithfully follow that regulation and Director Mueller is going to have the full . . . independence that he needs to conduct that investigation appropriately.'' More recently, on December 13, testifying before the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Rosenstein was again asked if there is good cause for firing Special Counsel Mueller. He responded with a firm no.

Members of Congress and commentators in the media who are now attacking the special counsel, the Justice Department, and the FBI for partisan political purposes are making a grave mistake. They will not succeed in deflecting law enforcement from its duties and missions, but they may well succeed in undermining the American people's faith and confidence in these institutions so vital to a healthy democracy. That is not only deeply unfortunate, it is shameful.

This is a remarkable moment in our Nation's history. A hostile foreign power has interfered in our Presidential election. Our law enforcement agencies and special counsel are working diligently to uncover the scope and methods of that intervention so that we can prevent a recurrence in the future. Supporting these efforts isn't about party or partisanship; it is about patriotism and defending America's democracy, which has been attacked and continues to be vulnerable to attack.

Our democracy is being tested, our law enforcement agencies are being tested, and we as Senators are being tested. Our responsibility is clear. We

have a duty to come together, Senators of both parties, to defend the independence of the Justice Department and the FBI, and we must insist that Special Counsel Mueller be allowed to conduct and complete his investigation without political interference.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Brown nomination?

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Peters
Bennet	Harris	Portman
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heinrich	Roberts
Brown	Heitkamp	Rounds
Burr	Hirono	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sanders
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Schumer
Casey	Jones	Scott
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Cochran	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Smith
Coons	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	Markey	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Enzi	Merkley	Warren
Ernst	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Wyden
Flake	Murray	Young
Gardner	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—8

Alexander	Durbin	McCain
Booker	Graham	Perdue
Cotton	Heller	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Walter David Counts III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, John Thune, Roger F. Wicker, James M. Inhofe, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Todd Young.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Walter David Counts III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Baldwin	Cochran	Fischer
Barrasso	Collins	Flake
Bennet	Coons	Gardner
Blumenthal	Corker	Gillibrand
Blunt	Cornyn	Grassley
Boozman	Cortez Masto	Harris
Brown	Crapo	Hassan
Burr	Cruz	Hatch
Cantwell	Daines	Heinrich
Capito	Donnelly	Heitkamp
Cardin	Duckworth	Hoeven
Carper	Enzi	Inhofe
Casey	Ernst	Isakson
Cassidy	Feinstein	Johnson
Jones	Murphy	Shelby
Kaine	Murray	Smith
Kennedy	Nelson	Stabenow
King	Paul	Sullivan
Klobuchar	Peters	Tester
Lankford	Portman	Thune
Leahy	Reed	Tillis
Lee	Risch	Toomey
Manchin	Roberts	Udall
Markey	Rounds	Van Hollen
McCaskill	Rubio	Warner
McConnell	Sasse	Warren
Menendez	Schatz	Whitehouse
Merkley	Schumer	Wicker
Moran	Scott	Wyden
Murkowski	Shaheen	Young

NAYS—1

Hirono

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander	Durbin	McCain
Booker	Graham	Perdue
Cotton	Heller	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Walter David Counts III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, once more I am coming to the floor to talk about the basic rules of the Senate and how we actually get on legislation.

We have spent all of this week on four district court judicial nominations—the entire week, no legislation—because we can't get on legislation.

In 2013, we were in a situation similar to this. The minority party, at that point being the Republicans, were slowing down the process in the Senate on nominations by the Democratic Party, at that point the majority. So Republicans and Democrats sat down together and said: This is a problem. We cannot get to legislation.

The Republicans and Democrats together, with 70-plus votes, made a 2-year rule change in the Senate in the 113th Congress. It was a simple rule change: 2 hours of debate for a district court judge, 8 hours of debate for just about everyone else, and 30 hours of debate for circuit court, Supreme Court, and Cabinet nominations. It was a bipartisan agreement that worked very well for that 2-year time period.

Then, at the end of that 2-year time period, it had a sunset on it, and it expired. The hope was that we would relearn how to be able to do this. I wasn't in the Senate at that time, but I have spoken to multiple people about that process.

What happened instead was, during the first year of that, there continued to be ongoing frustration, so my Democratic colleagues used what is affectionately called the nuclear option to be able to change the rules of the Senate to say that they could bring individuals with only 51 votes—not 60—and

then they used the rule, on top of what they changed, to bring people forward at greater speed, which they did. For the rest of the next year, they used it that way.

We now come to this time period. Let me give an example of what I am talking about and the frustration it creates. Let me confirm my number and make sure I get it right for all of the Senate history. From 1967 until 2012, there were 46 cloture votes invoked. That means they requested a cloture vote, and it went all the way to be a vote—46 of those on judges and the executive branch from 1967 to 2012.

Last year, there were 46 cloture votes in this body, just in 1 year. What was from 1967 until 2012 the total number, Democrats did to Republicans in 1 year—last year.

The statement keeps coming up over and over again: Why can't we get on legislation? Because each day is full of dead time, debating nominations—nominations like what passed today unanimously in the Senate. But we had to have cloture time set aside for it.

This has to be fixed. The rules of the Senate are set by the Senators. In 2013, the Senators stood up and said ''This has to stop,'' and they fixed it. I am recommending again that the Senate, once again, implement the same rule that Democrats led Republicans to do in 2013 now, in this year, and instead of doing it for one Congress, make it the rule. If it was a good idea for Democrats in 2013 and 2014, why is it not a good idea for Republicans and Democrats now?

That simple rule is, when we can't agree on a candidate, we would have only 2 hours of debate on a district judge—remembering that for the entirety of this week, it took the whole week to do four of them. We could do 2 hours of debate for each one if it is a district court judge, 8 hours for just about everybody else, or 30 hours of debate for Supreme Court, circuit court, and Cabinet-level nominations.

People would think that would be a slam dunk. So far it has not been. For some reason, my Democratic colleagues say: That rule was good for us, but it is not good for you, and it is not good for the future of the Senate. I believe it is. I believe it was a fair rule then, and it is a fair rule now. Enough debating about the rules of the Senate; let's get on to the business of the Senate and actually do what the American people sent us here to do.

Interestingly enough, there is also a very obscure rule in the Senate called rule XXXI. If, at the end of the year, there are still nominations that are pending out there, those nominations have to be returned to the White House, and they have to start all over again. The Senate can agree by unanimous consent to say that we all understand these are all in process and, by unanimous consent, just agree to those things to be able to hold them on the calendar.

Let me give an example. Under President Bill Clinton, at the end of his first year, only 13 of his nominations were sent back to the White House. After the end of George W. Bush's first term, only two nominations were returned back to the White House. After President Obama's first term, only eight were sent back to the White House. After President Trump's first term, 90 were sent back—Bill Clinton, 13; George Bush, 2; President Obama, 8; President Trump, 90.

I don't think my Democratic colleagues understand that they are continuing to amp up the volume of obstruction, saying: Someone has obstructed us in the past, so we are going to do it 10 times to you. All that leads to is that the next time the Republicans are in the minority, we do it 10 times again, and it makes it worse.

There is a way to fix this. We should come to that mutual agreement. We should resolve the rules of the Senate.

We have to get on to the budget. We have to get on to the Children's Health Insurance Program. We have to get on to intelligence issues. We have to get on to immigration. We have to get on to infrastructure. We have to get on to a lot of other things, but we are stuck debating about people, and that should be an easy one for us.

I am recommending to this body what my folks used to say to me: What is good for the goose should be good for the gander. If it was a great rule when Democrats were in the majority, it should be a great rule when Republicans are in the majority.

Let's take clean, fair rules and apply them to everyone. Let's move on with the nomination process. Let's get back to the business of doing legislation so we can get this resolved.

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.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OFFSHORE DRILLING

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Trump administration's recent proposal to expand offshore drilling to more than 90 percent of U.S. waters. This handout to Big Oil executives puts short-term corporate profits ahead of the long-term health and livelihood of America's coastal families, and it ignores the growing threat posed by climate change.

This administration is too weak-kneed to stand up for American families, too weak-kneed to say ''enough is enough'' when Big Oil executives demand more, and Big Oil executives keep demanding more because they don't like being told that any area is off limits.

Big Oil didn't like being told that the extraordinary natural, cultural, and historical value of Bears Ears and Grand Staircase-Escalante made them off limits for fossil fuel development. So President Trump opened up much of the previously protected land for future drilling and mining.

Big Oil didn't like being told that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, one of America's last untouched expanses of wilderness, was off limits. So President Trump and this Republican Congress included a provision in the Republican tax bill to allow drilling for the first time in this pristine reserve.

Big oil didn't like being told that our coasts, which provide the homes and livelihoods for millions of Americans, are off limits. So the Trump administration, faithful as ever to whatever Big Oil wants, issued a proposed offshore drilling plan that would allow drilling in more than 90 percent of America's coastal waters. In doing so, the Trump administration is threatening the Atlantic coast with unwanted oil drilling for the first time in more than 30 years, threatening to introduce new drilling rigs to the Pacific coast for the first time in 30 years, threatening the eastern Gulf of Mexico with drilling for the first time in more than 10 years, and threatening to illegally reopen portions of the Arctic for drilling in areas that were permanently protected in 2016.

Our coasts are working waterfronts supporting hard-working families. This unprecedented expansion of offshore drilling endangers hundreds of thousands of jobs that depend on the health of our oceans. In Massachusetts, there is shipping in and out of Boston, fishing from Gloucester to New Bedford, and tourism and small businesses on the Cape and the Islands. The ocean is our lifeline, as it is for so many coastal States and towns around the country.

The multibillion-dollar coastal economy has been a key part of the American economy since our Nation's founding. Our coastal communities are united in opposition to an expansion of offshore drilling. They understand the risks that Big Oil imposes on them.

Our coastal communities remember when the BP-Deepwater Horizon oilspill occurred in 2010. One offshore oil well blew and caused the Deepwater Horizon drilling rig to explode, and what was the consequence? It killed 11 workers, injured 17 more, and unleashed one of the worst environmental disasters in human history. Nearly 5 million barrels of oil gushed into the ocean, contaminating more than 1,300 miles of coastline and nearly 70,000 square miles of surface water. Millions of birds and marine animals died from exposure to the oil and other toxic chemicals. The gulf fishing industry lost thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue, and the spill devastated the gulf's coastal tourism economy. The environmental and economic devastation hit working families and small businesses across the entire region.

A commission formed to investigate the BP oilspill concluded that there were ''such systematic failures in risk

management that they place in doubt the safety culture of the entire [offshore drilling] industry.'' The Federal Government vowed to crack down on the offshore oil industry that had been cutting corners at the expense of worker safety and environmental safety. The Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement studied ways to improve oil rig inspections and issued new rules of the road to try to prioritize safety.

But President Trump has abandoned that safety-first approach. He ignores the lessons of the BP oilspill. Instead, he listens to his Big Oil friends. Last month, the administration began rescinding key safety regulations designed to protect our coastlines from another BP spill disaster. I just want to give one example.

In 2016 the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement implemented new rules to require independent, third-party certification of safety devices on oil rigs. It is not a bad idea to get someone independent to take a look at oil rigs before people put their lives at risk and hundreds of thousands of people could lose their livelihoods if an accident occurred—not a bad idea. But the Trump administration has said that this commonsense approach is an ''unnecessary . . . burden'' on industry. Just to be clear, this so-called burden would amount to less than a penny on the dollar for an industry that already enjoys tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies. That is less than a penny on the dollar to protect the livelihoods and maybe the lives of people living on our coasts.

The Trump administration's insistence on padding the pockets of Big Oil while small coastal towns are left carrying all the risk is a perversion of how government is supposed to work, but this is what happens when the Republican Senate allows leadership positions at the Department of the Interior to be filled with industry insiders who reward their past—and, in many cases, their future—employers, rather than serving the American people.

American families deserve forward-looking leadership that builds for the future and ensures that America will lead in the necessary fight against climate change, but President Trump thinks leadership is handing over management of our public resources to the Big Oil executives who are looking to stuff their pockets while they can, and he chooses to ignore the writing on the wall.

Our planet is getting hotter, and 16 of the last 17 years were the hottest on record. Our seas are rising at an alarming rate. Our coasts are threatened by furious storms that can sweep away homes and devastate even our largest cities. Many communities are just one bad storm away from complete devastation. Our naval bases are under attack, not by enemy ships but by rising seas. Our food supplies and our forests are threatened by an endless barrage of droughts and wildfires.

The effects of man-made climate change are all around us, and things will only continue to get worse at an accelerating pace if we don't do something about it. Will addressing climate change be tough? You bet it will. We will need to retool, to install offshore wind turbines instead of President Trump's offshore drilling rigs. But there is no country and no workforce in the world that is more willing and more able to tackle the challenges of climate change head-on than the United States of America. Yes, it is hard, but it is what we do. It is who we are.

The American people deserve leadership that knows the strength of the American people; leadership that believes in the innovative resolve of American workers ready to build clean energy infrastructure of the world; leadership that will deliver a clear message to the Big Oil executives, hell-bent on protecting their own short-term profits and who don't like being told that a place is off limits; leadership that will not chain our economy to the fossil fuels of the past; leadership that does not ignore the realities of climate change; and leadership that does not put our coastal communities at further risk of another devastating oilspill. The American people deserve leadership that works for their interests, not for the interests of Big Oil.

I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

THOMASINA E. JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT OF 2017

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today on a happy occasion, to discuss a House bill, H.R. 984, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act. This is a bill with a long history, and we are joined in the Chamber by the chiefs of six Virginia Tribes whose past, present, and certainly future are connected to this bill. I will speak briefly. Then, Senator WARNER will speak. Then, the matter will be called up for a voice vote. Various objections have been heard and then cleared, and so we are now ready to move forward with this bill, which passed the House in May.

This is about Virginia Tribes that were here and encountered the English when they arrived at Georgetown in 1607—the Tribes of Pocahontas and so many other wonderful Virginians. They are living, breathing, active Tribes. They have never been recognized by the Federal Government for a series of reasons.

First, they made peace too soon, in a way, and they have been punished for that. They entered into peace treaties with the English in the 1670s.

Second, many of their Tribal records were destroyed in the Civil War. Third, a State official destroyed other records during the 1920s through 1960s. The power of these Tribes having achieved State recognition beginning many years ago—and they have never given up hope that they would be recognized by the U.S. Government, just as they have been recognized for hundreds of years by the Government of England. In fact, last spring, they went to England to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the death of Pocahontas. They were treated as sovereigns, treated with respect, and all they have asked is to be given the same treatment by the country they love.

This bill for Tribal recognition was first introduced by a Virginia Governor, then-Senator George Allen, in the 107th Congress. A House companion bill to the Senate version was passed in May, and that is the third time the House has passed this bill—first in 2007, and the second time was in 2009.

I have had many productive discussions, as has Senator WARNER, over the last months about the bill, various questions about the history. We are now in a position where all objections have been cleared, and we are ready to move ahead.

It is such a treat to be joined by the chiefs. It is such a treat to be joined by my colleague, my senior Senator. Senator WARNER has worked tremendously hard on this, as have I, from the day he was Governor. I also have to give praise to Congressman WITTMAN on the House side, who has worked very hard to get to this day.

It is a fundamental issue of respect and fairly acknowledging a historical record and a wonderful story of Tribes who are living, thriving, and surviving and are a rich part of our heritage. This is a happy day to stand upon their behalf.

With that, I wish to yield to the senior Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me join my friend and colleague Senator KAINE. We and some of the folks who are in the Gallery today were not sure if this day would ever come. Even in the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Senate, occasionally we get things right. And, boy oh boy, this is a day where we get things right on a civil rights basis, on a moral basis, and on a fairness basis.

To our friends who are representatives of some of the six Tribes who are finally going to be granted Federal recognition, we thank you for your patience, your perseverance, and your willingness to work with us and others.

This has become an issue over the last 20-plus years. Democrats and Republicans alike in Virginia have acknowledged the fact that these six Tribes, whose history predates any European settlement in this country, whose history goes back, as Senator KAINE mentioned, where they were recognized by the United Kingdom and recognized by the British Government when they controlled our country—but through a series of circumstances, in many cases abetted by a backwards-looking government earlier in the 20th

century in Virginia that discriminated against these Native Americans in ways that were outrageous, where in many ways records that told of their proud history in our Commonwealth were destroyed after the Civil War in fires and courthouses—these Tribes have persevered.

Today, finally, they are going to be granted Federal recognition and the respect that goes with that Federal recognition, and they will be granted certain additional opportunities in terms of special education, housing grants, affordable healthcare services, and most importantly, the ability to recover important artifacts in their history.

As has been mentioned, this bill has already passed the House. ROB WITTMAN, a Republican Member, has been a champion.

Senator KAINE and I, both as Governors—in that role of Governor, one of the things that happen every day—every Thanksgiving day, these Tribes come in and, in effect, pay their taxes to the Commonwealth of Virginia. While Virginia has recognized these Tribes for some time, every year when we would have this ceremony—one of the most moving ceremonies that I know I have participated in as Governor, and I think Senator KAINE and Senator Allen, who was also a champion on this issue before us—these Tribes would come in and say: When will the U.S. Government recognize our existence, our history, and our legacy? Well, that wait is finally over.

In a moment, I am going to be asking for unanimous consent, and the long, long wait will come to an end.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Indian Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 984 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 984) to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. WARNER. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 984) was passed.

Mr. WARNER. I further ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the 1:45 p.m. vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Counts nomination?

Mr. INHOFE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Baldwin	Gardner	Nelson
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blumenthal	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Harris	Portman
Boozman	Hassan	Reed
Brown	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heinrich	Roberts
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Hirono	Rubio
Cardin	Hoeven	Sanders
Carper	Inhofe	Sasse
Casey	Isakson	Schatz
Cassidy	Johnson	Schumer
Cochran	Jones	Scott
Collins	Kaine	Shaheen
Coons	Kennedy	Shelby
Corker	King	Smith
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Leahy	Tester
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	Markey	Toomey
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall
Duckworth	McConnell	Van Hollen
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Enzi	Merkley	Warren
Ernst	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Wyden
Flake	Murray	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Alexander	Heller
Booker	McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand the Senate has received a message from the House to accompany S. 139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 139 and ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 10 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Barrasso	Feinstein	Nelson
Bennet	Fischer	Perdue
Blumenthal	Flake	Peters
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reed
Burr	Hassan	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cardin	Heitkamp	Rounds
Carper	Hoeven	Rubio
Casey	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Schumer
Cochran	Johnson	Scott
Collins	Jones	Shaheen
Corker	Kaine	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	King	Sullivan
Cotton	Klobuchar	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Duckworth	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Murphy	

NAYS—27

Baldwin	Heinrich	Paul
Brown	Hirono	Sanders
Cantwell	Leahy	Schatz
Coons	Lee	Smith
Daines	Markey	Tester
Durbin	Menendez	Udall
Gardner	Merkley	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Moran	Warren
Harris	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Heller	Toomey
Booker	McCain	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 10, I voted yea. It was my intention to vote nay. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the message from the House.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 139) entitled ''An Act to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.'', do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 139.

CLOTURE MOTION

I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 139, an act to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, John Thune, Mike Rounds.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1870

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 139, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to S. 139, with an amendment numbered 1870.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1871 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1870

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1871 to amendment No. 1870.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1872

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to refer the House message on S. 139 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 1872.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer the House message to accompany S. 139 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 1872.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1873

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1873 to the instructions of the motion to refer.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1874 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1873

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1874 to amendment No. 1873.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike ''4'' and insert ''5''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

RUSSIA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to share with my colleagues a report I released yesterday, which is the product of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The report is called ''Putin's Asymmetric Assault on Democracy in Russia and Europe: Implications for U.S. National Security.''

I commissioned this report to be done early in 2017. I had to make a decision on the allocation of resources, and I thought it was extremely important that the American people and the international community understand the breadth of Russia's campaign against democratic institutions.

Yes, we saw it in 2016 in the U.S. elections, but that was only one part of a much broader design, and I recognized we needed to devote the resources at that time in order to make this report work. It is how Russia has interfered not just here in the United States but in Europe.

I want to start with the statement that this is not a partisan report. Yes, I commissioned it as the Democratic ranking member because decisions had to be made early in 2017 on the allocation of resources. I know the Presiding Officer knows, I worked very closely with Senator CORKER on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and throughout the development of this report, I have kept Senator CORKER informed.

The work of this report has relied upon the work of many Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. In fact, I think the Presiding Officer will recall the work we did—Democrats and Republicans—in the passing of legislation in 2017 that held Russia accountable for its maligned activities. I was proud that I had the strong cooperation and support and leadership in developing that legislation from Senator MCCAIN, Senator GRAHAM, and Senator RUBIO, who contributed greatly to the enactment of that legislation, and on the Democratic side, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator SHAHEEN, and Senator DURBIN.

This report is the accumulation of a year's work. It had professionalism and dedication and patriotism of the very talented staff at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I want to acknowledge that because I know all of us recognize that our staffs are critically important to the work we do in the Senate.

Damian Murphy was our captain on this project. He was the one who provided the leadership to make sure we had a thorough report, that we had an accurate report, and that our recommendations would be tailored to make our Nation more secure. Terrell Henry provided incredible help throughout the entire year. Laura Carey was an instrumental part of getting this done. Megan Barkley helped us with making sure all of the sources were properly cited.

I also want to acknowledge my Democratic staff leader, Jessica Lewis, who really was the one who decided early that we could get this done and encouraged me to move forward.

Lastly, this report has received considerable attention since I released it yesterday—considerable attention—because this is the first comprehensive report that has been authored that deals with Russia's maligned activities, which are global in nature. Sean Bartlett was capable of making sure this story would be heard. I thank him for his professional work in the way we were able to get this report circulated.

Following the 2016 elections, I thought it was important that we shed more light on the Russian Government's efforts to interfere in democracies beyond our own. Anyone who thinks the threat posed by Russia is limited to hacking emails or the American election in 2016 is missing the real story, and that is what this report shows.

We wanted to describe the scale and scope of this threat to make the American people aware that the Russian Government's interference in the 2016 elections are part of a pattern of behavior and warn that Russia could attack again in 2018 and 2020. The Kremlin is a learning organization, and they are constantly perfecting and improving their techniques.

This report is the first government report to lay out in detail exactly how the Russians operate. Mr. Putin employs an asymmetric arsenal that includes not just military invasions—and they do use their military—but cyber attacks, disinformation and propaganda, and support for fringe political groups. They have employed the weaponization of energy resources. They have a network of organized crime, and they have a system that is fueled by corruption.

This threat existed long before President Trump and will remain following his tenure, unless he takes steps and we take steps to address it.

Our report examines how the Russian Government has sought to interfere in 19 countries across Europe. Many lessons are to be learned from our allies in Europe that have shown his behavior can be deterred. While many in the executive branch understand the threat and have taken steps to address Mr. Putin's asymmetric arsenal, Presidential leadership has been absent. Never before has a U.S. President so clearly ignored such a grave and growing threat to our national security, and without Presidential leadership, the United States will remain uncoordinated in its response.

The Washington Post reported in December that the National Security Council has not had a meeting on countering malign Russian influence—more than a year after the intelligence community assessment that Russia interfered in our elections.

Mr. Putin's rise to power in 1999 was cynical and opportunistic. He capitalized on a war in Chechnya and apartment bombings in Moscow to shore up his image as a strong hand that could steady the country after the rocky 1990s.

To do so, this former KGB officer emboldened his security services to play an outsized, criminal role in running the state. Mr. Putin's regime used violence to stop those who opposed him in and outside of Russia, cheated his way through the Olympics, and, through his security services' connections with organized crime and money laundering, has emboldened cyber theft and racketeering that has real-world implications for U.S. companies and citizens.

Mr. Putin developed his techniques first at home against his own people. In Russia, he repressed independent civil society, journalists, and political opposition, while manipulating cultural and religious influences, the media and information space, and a corrupt crony capitalist system to shore up his own regime.

The tools in Mr. Putin's asymmetric arsenal are drawn from a Soviet playbook but updated with new technologies. These include propaganda and disinformation, cultivating political fringe, religious and cultural groups as influencers, and weaponizing crime and corruption as a system of governance.

In Europe, Mr. Putin's Russia has invaded countries, attempted coups, cut off countries from energy in the middle of winter, temporarily crippled governments with cyber attacks, created a whole new way to exponentially spread fake news using bots and trolls, and used dirty money as a weapon to attempt to buy candidates and political parties. The report illustrates these events in more detail in the 19 countries across Europe.

The international response to the Kremlin's arsenal has been a patchwork. Some European countries have shored up their democracies in ways the United States has yet to do, in a strategic, whole-of-government fashion. Europe's experience with Russia's meddling shows it can be deterred, and the United States must take steps to deter Russia now, as laid out in the report's recommendations.

The report helps us to understand why Mr. Putin is doing this. He is doing this because that is all he has. Russia's economy is faltering. It has a limited military capacity. It doesn't have many friends around the world. Its economy is about 7 percent the size of the U.S. economy—ranks No. 12 in the world. It is smaller than Italy or South Korea or Canada, but we have to acknowledge he has had success with the use of these tools, with the use of these weapons.

He has accumulated, by reported sources, more than tens of billions of dollars of stolen wealth. He has a propaganda machine that has been able to make him popular at home and accomplish many of his objectives in other countries. He has slowed down Serbia's integration into the EU and Ukraine and Georgia's ability to join NATO because of Russia's troops located in its countries.

The report highlights the lessons we have learned from our Europeans. It is interesting, the Europeans understood this risk before we did and took action. The Brexit campaign in the UK, Russia was clearly engaged in it. Prime Minister May has made a resolute public statement that Russia's meddling is unacceptable and will be countered.

France looked at what happened in 2016 in the U.S. elections, and they took steps. The Macron campaign was subject to cyber attacks with emails from President Macron during the campaign. They were released shortly before the runoff election, but France was prepared, and they were able to counter that. The French Government worked with independent media and political parties to expose and blunt the dissemination of fake news.

In Germany, we saw the famous ''Lisa case'' that was fabricated by Russian-sponsored news outlets in order to incite the Russian-German community for an anti-migrant-type protest. The German Government bolstered democratic cyber security capabilities, particularly after the 2015 hack of the Bundestag, and the Interior Minister proposed creating a Center of Defense Against Misinformation. Germany has acted.

In the Nordic countries, the states have largely adopted a whole-of-society approach, with an emphasis on education that teaches critical thinking and media literacy. They have a curriculum in their school for their schoolchildren to be able to differentiate between what is real and what is fake in the news.

In Lithuania, the government diversified its supplies of natural gas. All the Baltic governments have worked to integrate their electricity grids to reduce dependency on Russia for energy needs.

In Spain, the Spanish Government has investigated, exposed, and cut off significant money-laundering operations by Russia-based organized crime.

So what do we do about this? Russia has this plan to compromise our democratic institutions. What do we do about it? Well, the report spells out many, many recommendations. I am proud to say that many of these recommendations have been championed by Members on both sides of the aisle.

First, we call upon Presidential leadership. We need President Trump to acknowledge the threat and establish a high-level interagency fusion cell to coordinate all elements of U.S. policy on the Russian Government's malign influence operations. The President should present to Congress a comprehensive national strategy and work to get it implemented and funded.

Second, the U.S. Government needs to support democratic institution building and values abroad. We need stronger support for these programs. The United States should provide assistance to help bolster democratic institutions in European states.

Members of the U.S. Congress should conduct hearings and use their platform to make democracy and human rights an essential part of their agenda. I am proud of the work we have done in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Working with Senator CORKER, we have highlighted human rights throughout the year, but we need to do more. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has recommended to the full Senate that we pass legislation so we can start evaluating every country and its ability to fight corruption, patterned after the ''Trafficking in Persons Report'' on human trafficking. We need to get that bill enacted into law.

Third, we need to expose and freeze Kremlin-linked dirty money. We should declassify any intelligence related to Mr. Putin's personal corruption and cut off Mr. Putin and his inner circle from the international financial system. We know that the elite class in Russia does not want to hold their money in rubles; they want dollars. We have to deny them that opportunity. They also would like visas to visit the United States; they don't want to be stuck in Russia. Those sanctions have an impact, and we need to make sure they are enforced.

Fourth, we need to create a ''state hybrid threat actors'' designation and impose a sanctions regime. The United States should designate countries that employ malign influence operations to assault democracies as ''state hybrid threat actors.'' Those designated would fall under a preemptive escalating sanctions regime that would be applied whenever the state uses weapons like cyber attacks to interfere with a democratic election or disrupt a country's vital infrastructure. We need to make it clear that, yes, we want relations with all countries, constructive relations, but if they are going to use these weapons against our democratic institutions, we need to be prepared to increase our sanctions against these countries.

Quite frankly, what we must understand is the importance of democracy against what Mr. Putin is trying to do.

Fifth, we have to defend the United States and Europe against foreign funding that erodes democracy. We need to pass legislation to require full disclosure of shell company owners and improve transparency for funding of political parties, campaigns, and advocacy groups. We have bipartisan legislation to do that. Let's get that passed. We know that shell companies are shielding illegal funds. Let's make sure that Russia's game plan is not funded through shell companies that are located here.

Sixth, we need U.S. leadership to build global cyber defenses and norms and to establish a rapid reaction team to defend allies under attack. We should push NATO to consider the implications of a cyber attack within the context of article V and our ability to defend each other. We should also lead an effort to establish an international treaty on the use of cyber tools in peacetime, modeled on the international arms control treaties.

Lastly, we need to hold social media companies accountable. Government should mandate transparency for funding political advertisements. This is the new way of communications. We have to catch up with technology in our laws. We require traditional advertisers to disclose all this information, but we have left social media alone because we didn't know about it when we passed these laws. We have to make sure that we have full laws on disclosure. Companies should conduct audits on possible Kremlin-supported meddling in European elections over the past several years. Companies should establish civil society advisory councils and work with civil society and government to promote media literacy.

That is just a sampling of some of the recommendations that are in this report. It is pretty comprehensive, but I think it does give us a game plan to understand that we can protect our national security, and we must.

Following the end to World War II, the United States led the world in constructing the liberal international order, underpinned by democratic institutions, shared values, and accepted norms. It protects our shared security, advances our interests, and expands our prosperity. Yet the defense of that system of institutions and democratic principles is anathema to Mr. Putin, who seeks to protect little more than his power and wealth. It is therefore up to the United States and our allies to engage in a coordinated effort to counter the Kremlin's assaults on democracy in Europe, the United States, and around the world.

In closing, we must take care to point out that there is a distinction between Mr. Putin's corrupt regime and the people of Russia, who have been some of his most frequent victims. Many Russian citizens strive for a more transparent and accountable government that operates under the democratic rule of law, and we hope for better relations in the future with a Russian Government that reflects these values. We applaud the courage we saw very recently from the protesters in Russia, who stood up against Mr. Putin because they want basic freedom in their country.

I remember very clearly that when we passed the Magnitsky law that holds those who violated the basic human rights, in Russia, of Sergei Magnitsky, who was just doing his job as a lawyer—that they would be denied our banking system and denied the ability to travel to this country—when that bill was enacted, it was the people who were protesting against the government who said: That law passed by the U.S. Congress was the most pro-Russian bill passed by the U.S. Congress. We stand with the people of Russia.

I am also the ranking Democrat in the U.S. Helsinki Commission. I have worked for the Helsinki Commission for a long time. The Helsinki Commission includes all the countries of Europe and the former Soviet Union, the United States, and Canada. All countries had signed on to the Helsinki Final Act. It talks about basic democratic principles, and it gives each member state the right to challenge the activities of every other member state.

We have an obligation to call out what Mr. Putin is doing because it is not only against our national security interests; it is not only hurting the people of Russia; it is against the commitments Russia made in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The United States must work with our allies to build defenses against Mr. Putin's asymmetric arsenal and strengthen international norms and values to deter such malign behavior by Russia or any other country.

I stand ready to work with all of my colleagues to protect our national security interests and to recognize the threat that Mr. Putin poses to our democratic institutions. I look forward to a day when we can truly have a better relationship with Russia because they stop this assault on democratic institutions in Europe, the United States, or anywhere in the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

MY SENATE AGENDA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, earlier this month, I announced that my current term of service would be my last. Since then, many of my colleagues have asked how I feel with my Senate tenure drawing to a close. I think many expect me to say that I feel an overwhelming sense of satisfaction and relief. Hardly. If anything, the decision to retire has imbued me with a sense of urgency that I have never felt before.

With a year left in office, I have an agenda that is as ambitious as ever,

and the ticking shot clock is a constant reminder of just how much I have left to accomplish. Just 168 legislative days remain in my Senate term, and I can assure you that those 168 days will be among the proudest and the most productive periods in all my public service.

Anyone who thought ORRIN HATCH would coast quietly into his golden years clearly doesn't know me. The stars have aligned for this year to be one of my most successful yet. So don't expect me to go gentle into that good night. Expect me to be right here on the Senate floor, early and often, pushing the most critical reforms of this Congress. Expect me to take the lead on a Finance Committee agenda that will equal in ambition our accomplishments of 2017. Expect me to be the same steady presence in this body that I have been for the last 41 years.

Above all, expect a flurry of legislative activity from my office. I have a dedicated staff. They are determined to drive this old workhorse into the ground. And I have arguably the best working relationship with this President of anyone on Capitol Hill. Add to this the advantages that accrue from a lifetime of legislative experience and bipartisan dealmaking.

The point I wish to make is simple: In legislative terms, my final year could well be the most fruitful yet, and I hope it will be.

In the months ahead, I am eager to capitalize on our tax reform victory by putting the Nation back on the path to fiscal sustainability, finding a way forward on immigration, and securing long-term funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program—a program that I helped put into law and have been very pleased with over the years. I also intend to update our intellectual property laws for the 21st century, enact key fixes to our higher education system, and fill our courts with as many qualified judges as possible. Likewise, I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle to improve the competitiveness of our workforce, strengthen digital privacy, and blaze new trails on medical marijuana research.

But this brief overview doesn't cover even half of my agenda for 2018, nor does it include some of the legislative surprises I plan for later this year. The virtue of being a seven-term Senator with a reservoir of good will is that you have a little bit of latitude in your final year. That is why my plan is to go big and to go bold, because unless you are Michael Jordan, you retire only once, so you might as well make the most of it.

The truth is, I put the pieces in place long ago to ensure that my final year in office would be a legislative knockout, so no one should count me out, not for a single second, and anyone who does should be reminded that I can do in just a few months what it takes most a decade to complete. Tough old birds like me don't have lameduck years; we just dig in and get tougher. For me, 2018 is not a victory lap but a sprint to the finish, and I plan to finish strong. I look forward to working with all of you until the very end.

With that, I just want to say how much I love the Senate, how much I love my colleagues on both sides of the floor, how much I have enjoyed working with all of you over all these years and will enjoy this remaining year hopefully even more. I hope I can do some things that will be very beneficial to our country, to all of us, and that will help us all feel better about our service here and help us all strive to do better together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from Utah, who just spoke, who is also the President pro tempore of this entire body, that he is well regarded on both sides of the aisle. I don't think any Senator has had a more distinguished or consequential career—four decades of legislating.

I want to assure the Senator that nobody thinks he is going to slow down. In fact, as he just said, he has plenty on his agenda for the next year, and we look forward to working with him during that time period.

We also wish him well on his retirement. I have talked to him a little about this. He has a wonderful family, and he has big plans for the future with some important work he wants to do in public policy through his foundation.

I have so much respect for Senator HATCH. I thank him so much for what he did most recently to help guide us through this latest tax reform and tax cut bill that actually is making a difference for the people I represent and he represents.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield, I thank the Senator so much. I am grateful for the friendship that I have with all of you but especially with him. He is one of the up-and-coming, moving, strong Senators in this body. I have tremendous respect for his work ethic, the effort he has put forth on a daily basis, the ethics that he imposes upon himself, and the logistical all around way of doing the Senate's work. I am very pleased to have him as a friend.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Senator. I have to get the last word, though, because this is about the Senator.

Senator HATCH said he loves this place and he loves its Members. There is a lot of love for him in this place on both sides of the aisle, and it is well deserved and earned.

RUSSIA

Mr. President, I heard Senator CARDIN earlier speaking about the threat that Russia poses not just to us—and the meddling that has been occurring here in our elections over the years—but also the threat that they pose to other democracies around the world, particularly in Eastern Europe. I appreciate his report. I appreciate the fact that he has worked with a number of us, including Senator MURPHY, on the other side of the aisle, to put forward legislation to try to push back against this disinformation.

In fact, we have required that the State Department increase their efforts through what is called the Global Engagement Center. I am meeting with the Deputy Secretary of State here after this speech, and I am going to speak more about that with him, but we really want to be sure that the United States is taking more aggressive action against the kind of disinformation that can destabilize democracies.

We heard some of the examples of what his report was able to uncover in terms of some of the Russian activity, particularly, again, in Europe and in Eastern Europe. This is an issue. It is a foreign policy issue that we have been, in my view, slow to respond to. It didn't start with the last Presidential election, and it will not end with this last Presidential election unless we take a more aggressive stance and step up.

So I appreciate that it has been a bipartisan effort that we should acknowledge as Americans that it is in our interests to push back against the disinformation and the propaganda and the destabilization of democracies.

TAX REFORM

Today, Mr. President, I wish to speak about some good news; that is, that here in Congress we actually did something with the tax relief and tax reform legislation that is actually creating a better economy and more hope for people.

There was news announced today, just a few minutes ago, that is in addition to the news we have heard over the last few weeks. This historic tax reform was created, we will remember, with two goals in mind. One was to cut taxes for middle-class families—so individual tax cuts. The second part of it was to make America a better place to do business. Let's ensure that there will be more jobs created here rather than elsewhere. Let's level the playing field so our workers aren't competing with one hand tied behind their back.

As I have said through the process and as we developed this bill, we had a bipartisan agreement that our Tax Code was broken, but we couldn't seem to come up with an agreement of how to fix it. Some Democrats said: Well, that is great that you guys have done this bill, but it is not going to help. I said at the time: The proof will be what happens, what happens to jobs, what happens to wages, what happens to the economy in general, and what happens to your paycheck.

I am here to announce today that the results have been pretty darn impressive, and they have been across the board—all of those things I talked about. We have already seen as a result of this tax legislation that America has become a better place to do business. All over the country there are companies and businesses, small and large,

that have stepped forward to talk about that. I now have a list of 150 businesses—and I am sure there are many, many more—that have decided to do something. Either they announced a pay increase, a bonus, an increased 401(k) contribution, an increased pension contribution, or maybe a new investment in equipment and in technology to make workers more competitive. All of this is specifically because of the tax relief and reform bill. That is what is happening.

For those who haven't followed it, even today another company, Walmart—the largest employer in my State—announced that they are indeed going to increase pay and provide bonuses to over 1 million workers. Some companies have actually announced a combination of things, not just a pay increase but maybe a pay increase as well as an increased contribution to a 401(K) or an increased contribution to a charity.

So I think we are already seeing the direct effects—the direct and very positive beneficial effects—of this tax reform legislation, as many have hoped that we would see, given the fact that we wrote it to create these incentives for more jobs and better jobs.

But today we are going to begin to see the direct effects of the other part of the bill; that is, the tax relief directly to individuals. The IRS just announced about an hour ago that they are publishing updates to the tax withholding tables for employers. Now, what does this mean? This means that Uncle Sam is going to take a little less of your paycheck, and you are going to see it on your paycheck. So the withholding—the amount that is withheld from your paycheck with taxes—is going to be changed. The Treasury Department says that for 90 percent of Americans—90 percent—there will be a change in withholding that will be positive for them. In other words, they will have less money coming out of their paycheck.

Most people whom I represent in my home State of Ohio live paycheck to paycheck. This is really important. We talked earlier about how much this is going to be: $2,000 a family on average. That is the median income for a family in Ohio. Whatever the amount is, this is significant, and it is something that people are going to be pretty surprised about because so many people have misrepresented what this legislation is about. They are now seeing that it is about jobs, it is about wages, it is about bonuses, and so on. But they are also going to see in their own paycheck that it is about more take-home pay. It is about having a little healthier family budget.

So, again, as we went through this process, when we would have these debates I would say: I encourage people to look online, to look at the professionals, to look at a tax calculator. I said: The proof is in your paycheck. I think the proof will be in their paychecks—more hard-earned money staying in their pocket rather than going to Washington is something that my constituents will like, particularly if we see this economy start to pick up because of this tax reform bill, which, by the way, will result in a stronger economy.

Therefore, there will be more revenue through growth. So the Federal Government will have more revenue coming in. Every 1-percent increase in GDP—a 1-percent increase in growth in this country—means about $2.7 trillion in increased revenue coming into the Federal coffers. So that is more revenue coming in, not from a tax increase but from growth. That is the kind of revenue we want to have to be able to deal with many issues we face on the fiscal side, including our large deficits and debt, and that we will also begin to see as we see a better economy grow and develop because of this tax reform legislation. That is my strong belief and, again, I think the evidence is pretty clear that we are headed that way.

I want to commend the IRS for moving so quickly because this is pretty quick for us to turn it around. We just passed the legislation at the end of the year. It became effective on January 1. Here we are on January 11, and we are already seeing them changing the withholding that is going to go to the employers so that employers will withhold less from people's paychecks.

I also want to personally commend the Treasury Secretary, Steven Mnuchin, because I know he has a passion to make sure that our hard-working taxpayers get this tax relief as soon as possible. My sense is that he is the one who has promoted our moving quickly on this, in a professional and careful way so that the withholding tables are accurate but ensuring that we do allow people to begin to have a little more in their paychecks to be able to help make ends meet. Again, with most people I represent living paycheck to paycheck this is a big deal. Steve Mnuchin has been, I think, essential to getting this done as quickly as it has been done, as he was essential in the tax reform legislation, along with Gary Cohn of the White House, and others.

So this law is going to help middle-class families in three main ways.

First, it cuts taxes across the board. As I noted, the IRS announcement means that about 90 percent of taxpayers will see more money in their paychecks. They do this in a number of ways in the tax reform legislation, and I am talking about the reform notice here. It is Notice 1036. For those who want to go online and look at it, just go on the IRS website, irs.gov, and you can see it, the new withholding tables. They lay all of this out. Depending on how much your paycheck is, whether you are paid weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, or monthly, you see what your benefits are going to be. But it happens because there is a doubling of the standard deduction, and most people already take the standard deduction in my State of Ohio. Now more people will take it because there is a doubling and essentially a zero tax bracket. So it goes from about $12,000 a family to about $24,000 a family.

It also has a lowering of the rate of tax. So your tax rate is going to be lower relative to what it was before this.

Also, if you have kids, you get a doubling of the child tax credit, including part of that being an increase in the refundability of that if you don't have income tax liability. But if you still have expenses, if you still have payroll taxes, you get your benefit there.

So these are the kinds of things that, combined, end up with this notice going out saying: You are going to have a little more in your paycheck.

Second, the result of these tax cuts is going to take about 3 million Americans off the tax rolls altogether. I say ''about'' because the Joint Committee on Taxation doesn't have the final number yet but they have told me that it is at least 3 million Americans who now pay income taxes who will no longer have income tax liability. Now, they may have payroll tax liabilities, and they may have State and local taxes, but the point is that this was about Federal income reform and relief, and they are going to be out from under the IRS and again be able to help make ends meet. That is as a result of this legislation. I said earlier that about $2,000 per family is the average tax savings for a median family income in Ohio, $2,000 a year in tax relief is about the average.

This is important because as expenses have gone up over the last couple of decades—particularly, healthcare expenses in the last decade—wages have not. So wages have been relatively flat. In fact, on average, if you take inflation into account, they have been flat over the last couple of decades. We are beginning to see some increase in wages now. This is terrific, but with wages being flat and expenses up, people have had a real squeeze, and that middle-class squeeze is real in my home State. So this is extra money that families—many people living paycheck to paycheck—can use for expenses like healthcare, maybe make a car payment, save for retirement, or maybe help their kids.

The second goal of this tax reform, boosting the American economy, is also beginning to happen, as I said earlier. When the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act became law, immediately we saw a number of companies and businesses, small and large, around the country say: We are going to do something about this. I remember being home over the holidays and, actually, the day after Christmas, December 26, I was talking with friends, and a guy who owns a small manufacturing business, the brother of a friend of mine, said: Would you be willing to come out to our little company to talk about the tax bill?

I said: Sure, if we can figure it out schedulewise.

He said: Because I want to give my employees a bonus. I am looking at this tax bill, how it is going to affect our little business, and what it is going to do for us to be able to invest more in the company, and I want to give my employees a $1,000 bonus—everybody, 137 employees—and I also want to do something in terms of investing in my equipment because I want to make my people more competitive.

This is a small manufacturer in Cincinnati, OH, that makes a high-quality product, a precision product, and he wants to make sure that his people have the best equipment to be competitive. In his case, he has competition from overseas, as do a lot of American businesses, either directly or indirectly these days in an increasingly global economy, and he wants to be sure he is competitive. So I went there.

I went to the company, Sheffer Corporation, and I had the opportunity to talk about the tax reform bill and what it does across the board. He made the announcement, and I can tell you that people were very happy because these are folks who work hard and play by the rules. They aren't looking for any kind of a handout, but what they do want is to be able to know that if they work hard and do the right thing, they will be able to see a little better future for themselves and their kids and their grandkids and not have that middle-class squeeze we talked about, where wages are flat and expenses are up.

When the economy is not growing at a fast rate, which we have seen over the last decade, it is really a challenge. When we have an economy growing at 2 percent or less, it is tough to see that kind of open opportunity. Now, with this tax reform bill, I think we have a much better chance of seeing that. In fact, looking at some of the projections for next year, it looks like most people think the economy is going to grow at better than 2 percent—maybe 3 percent or maybe a little higher. We don't know. The point is that people are going to have more hope and opportunity.

It is not just Sheffer, though. In my hometown of Cincinnati, the Fifth Third Bank announced a companywide wage increase. So wages are going to go up for entry-level jobs and push all wages, as well as bonuses, for 13,000 employees in Cincinnati.

Across the country we have seen this. Tomorrow I will be at a plant in Cleveland, OH, that is putting more money into their pension plan. I think it is going to be about $15 million into a pension plan, which isn't in terrible shape, but it could be a lot healthier. That is going to help those employees directly.

Last Friday I was at a plant in Columbus, OH, a small manufacturer, Wolf Metals. They do an awesome job there competing with people all around the globe, and they are going to make more investments in equipment. In fact, I like this comparison to the tax bill because one of the pieces of equipment—a $1 million piece of equipment they are going to replace with the tax bill savings—is 32 years old. The Tax Code that we reformed was 31 years old. So it is time, don't you think, every few decades to actually reform our Tax Code, to bring it up to speed and make it more competitive to give our workers the edge, just as it is time to replace that machine to give his employees, what they need to compete globally.

Nationwide Insurance in Columbus, OH, is going to reinvest in their workers. Western & Southern Financial Group, Boeing, Comcast, and AT&T are some of the big companies we have heard about. They have all announced increased investments in their workers and new investments in their operations as a result of this law.

With regard to Walmart, they employ about 1.5 million Americans now. As I said, it is the largest employer in Ohio, with over 50,000 employees. They are going to raise wages, provide bonuses, and expand benefits for the workers as a result of this tax reform legislation.

So these are the results. This isn't a hypothetical. This is not something we are just saying might happen; it is something that is actually happening.

I think every single American is going to see a benefit from this because a stronger economy helps everyone. The 90 percent of people who see their withholdings change so that they have more tax relief are obviously going to see it. The people who work in the businesses we have talked are going to see it. But all of us benefit.

President John F. Kennedy once said something I think makes a lot of sense. He talked about a rising tide. He said, ''A rising tide lifts all . . . [ships].'' In other words, it helps to have a growing economy.

These results are going to help with regard to our competitiveness too. Right now, we have a situation where, because of our Tax Code, jobs and investments are going overseas. Now, we may not hear as much about this, but what we are going to see is fewer foreign companies buying U.S. companies and, therefore, less investment in jobs going overseas.

In 2016, the last year for which we have numbers, three times as many American companies were bought by foreign companies as the other way around. Ernst & Young has done a study saying that over the past 13 years, 4,700 American companies were purchased by a foreign company that otherwise would still be American if we had in place this tax bill that we have now.

Part of the result of this tax reform and tax cut legislation we are talking about today is obvious. We will see better jobs, higher wages, more investment in companies, more investment in retirement—all the things we all want to see, Republican and Democrat alike. Part of it is the tax cuts. Today, with the IRS announcement, people will see this in their paychecks. If not this next pay period, they will see it before February 15 because that is what the Treasury Department is requiring companies to do. So it is coming soon.

The other part we may not see, but is very real, is that the decline we have seen in American competitiveness—the result being that jobs and investment go overseas—is going to start to reverse, and it is none too soon. We needed to do this years ago. Many of us have been talking about it for years.

Finally, we are putting American workers in a position where they can compete and they can win. Isn't that what it is all about? I don't want these 4,700 companies going overseas. I don't want three times as many American companies bought by foreign companies instead of the other way around. We don't want that. What we want is people to say: I am going to invest in America and American workers.

I believe we have so many advantages in this country, and we are so blessed to be Americans. We have great universities. We have the opportunity here, through our workforce, to be as productive as anybody in the world. But when we have a tax code that is holding us back, it is unfair. It is our responsibility as Members of Congress to fix it, and that is what we have done. We should have done this sooner, but now that we have done it, I think we will see continued good results, as we have talked about today. We are going to see the opportunity for more investments in American workers, in American jobs, in American families, and in American businesses, and that investment will pay off for all of us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, today I was honored to be invited to the White House and included in a small meeting with President Trump, and it was very clear that I was invited to the White House to stand firm with President Trump today. We talked about immigration, and today I was proud to stand with our President.

We have been crystal clear. Chain migration must end, period. Any solution to our current immigration crisis that the U.S. Senate will consider must include ending chain migration. Before I talk about the details of what chain migration is, I want to put it in perspective.

Our immigration crisis today has been longstanding. We had a law written in 1965 and other changes in 1986, but it has really not been since 1991 that there has been any meaningful immigration change.

Three times in the last 11 years, well-intended people in this body and in the House have done a yeoman's job of trying to solve the comprehensive problem of immigration in the United States—without success. Here we are, again, right now, facing a deadline that the President has put on, and rightfully so. We have a sense of urgency.

The President has done a couple of things. He has defined the scope of the problem, and he has defined a sense of urgency for the people in Congress.

The legal immigration system right now is broken, but to deal with that, we have to deal with our entire immigration system in pieces. The reason I believe most past efforts have failed is that they tried to do a comprehensive solution.

Today, we are breaking it into three areas. One is our legal immigration system, and the next step might be our temporary work visas. Today, we bring in about 1.1 million legal immigrants a year, and I will talk about how that relates historically. But we issue about 2.2 million temporary work visas a year. Then the third issue is, of course, the people who are in the United States illegally.

President Trump had a meeting 2 days ago at the White House. In that meeting, he had Democrats, Republicans, Members of the House, and Members of this body, the Senate, and he drove consensus in that meeting.

It was very interesting that he had the media in there for almost 60 minutes for an open dialogue, and we heard from all people in that room about their position on these topics. I thought it was very interesting that the President had the courage to put this issue in front of the American people and create an air of transparency that we have not had on this issue in decades. In that meeting, he drove two conclusions: one, a scope of the problem and, two, a sense of urgency.

The scope is very simply defined as this: We have to address the DACA situation. The President has given Congress the date of March 5 to come up with a solution for these individuals who are in the country illegally—but not of their doing.

The second issue is border security. We know that border security is a national security issue as much as it is an immigration issue. The good news is that we know that illegal crossings of our southern border are down dramatically this year just because of a couple of reasons. One is the enforcement of current law, and the second is an understanding around the world that we are going to deal with this issue.

The third piece of the scope is chain migration. Any solution to the DACA situation or the legal immigration situation must include addressing the chain migration issue.

Then the last is this archaic diversity visa lottery we have in the United States that was related to at least one of the terrorist attacks, and chain migration was involved in both of the terrorist attacks we have recently experienced here in the United States.

With regard to DACA, the first item on the scope is that we know we have a March 5 deadline. There is a growing consensus in this body of how to deal with that, and there is great latitude on the part of Republicans in this body to deal with that in a way, with our Democratic partners here, to get a consensus bill that solves this once and for all.

The second is border security. Here, with the President's leadership and in these recent meetings with Democrats and Members of the House, there is a growing consensus that we can deal with the national security issues related to our southern border. We don't need a 2,000-mile wall, as even the President of the United States has said just this week. But there are things we need to do, and we need to do them quickly.

The President today said that his goal is to get this done this year. Coming from the real world, I know that is possible. This President, who comes from the real world and is an outsider to this community here in Washington, knows that is possible, and I think he is going to hold us accountable to that.

The third area I mentioned before is chain migration. I will say more about that in a minute.

The fourth is the diversity lottery. This diversity lottery has not served us well. It is not the number; it is the way it is being handled. We know there is fraud, and we know this is a loophole terrorists are now using to put people in their chain inside the United States.

There is a growing consensus on these four items of this scope that the President has defined, and we had a consensus in that room 2 days ago in the White House. There is consensus that we can get to a solution within the timeframe here, but let me be very clear. Any deal—whether it is in business, sports, or certainly in politics—has to have some symmetry. Therefore, any solution for the DACA situation must include a solution for our chain migration crisis.

We must continue working with the President. He is holding us accountable. He is moving at a business pace, but to do that, we really have to talk about chain migration. I understand there are other areas that we have to talk about, as well, but there is a lot of disinformation about what it really is.

Chain migration is nothing more than a law put in place in 1965 to allow legal permanent residents and U.S. citizens to sponsor people for U.S. citizenship. It was put in place in 1965. It has been updated a little bit. But today, a legal permanent resident—for the most part, this is someone who has come in qualified in our legal immigration system, who goes through a 5-year waiting period, who eventually can apply for U.S. citizenship. While they are a legal permanent resident, almost immediately they can sponsor spouses, minor children, and unmarried adult children. That is current law.

Once they become a citizen—and this is true of any U.S. citizen, whether they were a recent immigrant or were born here; a U.S. citizen can sponsor their parents, their spouses, minor children, unmarried adult children, married adult children, and siblings.

The issue around this is pretty simple. We have a chart here which shows that in 1965, when this law was put in place, approximately 300,000 U.S. citizens were brought into the United States in that year under this system. Last year, we had, roughly, about 1.1 million. We had a high of somewhere close to 1.3 million. But we can see, this is a geometric progression that increases unbounded. It is not really the number here, but it is the balance that we have lost.

What happens, and the criticism I have as a business guy looking at this, is that the individuals who determine who future immigrants are going to be are current and recent immigrants.

We don't have many guidelines. We have a country cap system which says that most countries have a percentage of the total they have to have, and they can't exceed that. But there is no real cap here, such that if all these numbers were maximized, then over time you would see this number go up geometrically.

We have a second chart that shows this and demonstrates that over a very short period of time, the numbers can increase dramatically, as we have seen in the last 40 or so years.

There have been studies on this. Princeton has a study which says that right now, based on recent history, any immigrant who comes in sponsors somewhere around 3.5 future immigrants within a short period of time. We don't know what the 3.5 immigrants do when they get sponsored and become citizens or legal permanent residents, but if you extrapolate this out—let's say we start with 2 million as a starting point. They become citizens and they sponsor—let's just say the number is 3. In the first iteration, now we have 6 million people sponsored by the original 2 million; then the second iteration goes from 6 to 18; and in the fourth iteration we are at 54 million people. So all of a sudden, as you can see, there is no limit here, other than the country caps, and the country caps do not limit the total number. They limit the mix.

What is wrong with this system? The problem, as I said just now, is that future immigrants are determined by current immigrants without any regard to their ability to participate in the system.

The second one is that because you can bring parents in, immigrants who come in under this system and become U.S. citizens can bring their parents in, and all of a sudden, now we have an aged population coming in—not a younger population—and they then draw social services on an already bankrupt system.

Chain migration is not based on skill or the ability to participate in the current economic situation in the United States. Last year, we brought in 1.1 million immigrants. Of that, 140,000 were immigrants who were related to the worker; 70,000 were the workers, and the other 70,000 were their immediate family. So we can see that over 950,000 people were derivative iterations of what I am talking about.

The third thing is that if chain migration is not stopped, it continues to incentivize future illegal immigration because of what you can do once you get here.

Chain migration is another problem with the DACA situation because if you permit a pathway to some sort of legalized situation in the United States for the DACA population, you end up with a situation where those people who are then legalized can sponsor their parents. The problem with that is, the DACA population is not violating fair law, but their parents have.

The last issue I will bring up is, the national security issues are profound. We have seen two national security incidents just this past year related to chain migration and the diversity visa lottery. There is more than enough evidence to show this has to be addressed.

Again, any symmetric deal on immigration has to include, I believe, the four points the President talked about the other day. We have to deal with the DACA situation. We have to deal with our border security, and that means building a wall. We have to deal with the chain migration issues, and we have to deal with this diversity visa lottery. The President demands it. The American people demand it. Today, as a matter of fact, over 80 percent of America believes we need to deal with the DACA situation. Likewise, 72 percent of people in America believe the immigration law should be the worker, the spouse, and their immediate minor children only—72 percent. I can't think of another issue that has come before this body where we had those sorts of agreements in the American population.

The President wants results. He has charged leadership in this body and the House and those of us who have been involved in this for some time to get to it. There is a March 5 deadline looming. Some people say there is a January 19 date that has to do with funding the government. I personally believe the two have nothing to do with each other, but we want a sense of urgency. The President has demanded it. We need it.

We know there are going to be other steps. This is not the last step to this problem. We know we have to deal with how we bring people to the United States. We need a balance. Of course, we want to continue to be the open arms of the world today in terms of welcoming people to our shores. Just look at what is written on the Statue of Liberty. Who can argue with that? At the same time, we have to have a balance. Right now, we don't bring in people who are contributing to the economy, for the most part, and we are eliminating—we are not bringing in people who can contribute. All we are asking for is a dialogue to bring balance back to that system.

I am excited to be a part of this dialogue because I believe we have a unique, historic opportunity with people on the other side and people on this side who generally have hearts that are not that dissimilar with regard to how to deal with the DACA population, how to deal with the Dreamers population, how to deal with future immigrant populations that are coming to the United States. We can have those debates, and we are having them now. I welcome input from all points. I am anxious to get to the bottom line of this.

I will close with this. It is exciting to have leadership from the executive branch on this issue that has put the responsibility back on this body to come up with something that will not allow us to be back here in the next 3, 5, or 20 years dealing with this same problem. We have a historic opportunity. It is time to get to it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I have been consistently voting against cloture motions to proceed to debate on judicial nominations, and I would like to take this opportunity to explain why. The Senate has a constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on judicial nominees, and I take this obligation very seriously.

The American people depend on the Senate to fully consider and vet each judicial nominee because throughout the course of their lifetime appointment, judges will issue rulings and opinions that touch each of our lives. The process of nominating, considering, and confirming judges should be a deliberate one. Its purpose should not be to confirm as many judges as quickly as possible. Senators should be able to provide input on who should sit on the Federal bench; Senators should have an adequate opportunity to hear from third-party experts about the records and qualifications of each nominee; and Senators should have enough time to question and examine a nominee during a confirmation hearing.

Insisting on a deliberate and comprehensive process is not, as some of my Republican colleagues might argue, an effort to deny the President his prerogative to nominate judges to lifetime appointments to the Federal bench. Instead, this process is essential in determining whether each nominee is qualified for the job and can separate their personal ideology from the decisions he or she renders. For a lifetime appointment to the Federal bench, this shouldn't be too much to ask.

Over the past year, we have observed a number of concerning issues in the nomination and confirmation process for Federal judges that need to be corrected. The President has essentially outsourced the judicial selection process to two organizations with strong, ideologically driven agendas—the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation.

The Federalist Society, for example, describes itself as ''a group of libertarians and conservatives dedicated to reforming the legal order.'' This is a group that has supported legal efforts to undermine environmental protection, erode the constitutional right to choose, and blur the lines between church and State.

The Heritage Foundation describes its mission as one to ''promote conservative public policies.'' Over the past few years alone, this organization, this group, has fought to undermine the Affordable Care Act, oppose LGBTQ rights, and erode the ability of Federal agencies to issue lifesaving regulations. It is not unreasonable to assume that these organizations, through their close association with the White House, expect their ideologically driven agendas to be reflected in the nominees they recommend.

While I concur with Justice Rehnquist's assertion that no judge joins a court tabula rasa, or as a blank slate, we should have a baseline expectation that lifetime appointees should be able to render justice free from their own personal ideologies. At the same time as the Trump administration relies more heavily on the Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation to select its judicial nominees, it is devaluing the work done by the American Bar Association. The ABA has reviewed and vetted judicial nominees in a nonpartisan manner for over 60 years. With the exception of George W. Bush and now Donald Trump, Presidents in both parties have consulted with the ABA prior to officially nominating to the bench.

President Obama, for example, provided a great demonstration for how this process should work. Working closely with the ABA, President Obama routinely submitted potential candidates for scrutiny prior to their formal nomination. After conducting their independent, nonpartisan reviews, the ABA issued ''not qualified'' ratings for 14 candidates who had been proposed by President Obama. President Obama followed the ABA's recommendation and did not formally nominate any candidates rated ''not qualified.''

Under President Trump, on the other hand, we no longer wait for the ABA to complete its assessment of nominees prior to a nomination hearing itself, much less before the nomination. We no longer have an opportunity to review the ABA's report and, in many cases, do not have the chance to question an ABA representative at a nomination hearing about its review of the nominee.

We have seen the serious consequences of this change in practice in two high-profile nominations this year.

Despite having never tried a case, President Trump nominated Brett Talley to serve the District Court for the Middle District of Alabama. Mr. Talley was nominated, given a hearing, and listed for a Judiciary Committee vote before the ABA could even finish its evaluation. Given his complete lack of qualifications for the job, it wasn't

surprising that the ABA unanimously rated him ''not qualified.'' Because he was rushed through the nomination process, we only learned later that Mr. Talley failed to disclose that his wife works in the White House Counsel's office. After two Republicans on the committee—Senator GRASSLEY and Senator KENNEDY—expressed their opposition to Mr. Talley, he, fortunately, withdrew from consideration.

We were not so lucky with Steven Grasz, who was recently confirmed to the Eighth Circuit. Mr. Grasz was nominated and scheduled for a Judiciary Committee hearing before the ABA could complete its review. By the time the ABA finished its exhaustive evaluation, during which it found him to be not qualified, Mr. Grasz was scheduled to appear before the Judiciary Committee in less than 48 hours. This was not nearly enough time to adequately address and assess the ABA's conclusion that Mr. Grasz would not be able to serve as a judge without the undue influence of his personal beliefs.

Courts are supposed to protect the rights of minorities, and it is troubling to reflect on the ABA's conclusion that Mr. Grasz would be unable to divorce his positions on issues like reproductive and LGBTQ rights from the cases he will hear on the Eighth Circuit. Circuit court judges are only one step away from the U.S. Supreme Court and deserve to be scrutinized closely in the Judiciary Committee. Unfortunately, last year, the Judiciary Committee overrode the objections of the minority to hold four nomination hearings with more than one circuit judge nominee considered simultaneously.

To put this in some historical context, the Judiciary Committee held four such hearings in the entire 8 years Barack Obama was President, and it held each of these hearings with the consent of the Republican minority on the committee. During hearings on circuit and district court nominees, each committee member generally has only 5 minutes to question nominees—many of whom are highly controversial and deserve maximum scrutiny. Five minutes, which includes the time the nominee takes to respond, is not nearly enough time to engage in meaningful dialogue about a nominee's judicial philosophy or to examine controversial cases a nominee may have decided in the past.

The American people deserve much more as we consider lifetime appointments to the Federal bench. I am also concerned about the erosion of the blue-slip process, which has traditionally been a collaborative mechanism to enable Senators to confer with the White House on nominees from their States. Although there have been exceptions over the years, Presidents and Senate majorities of both parties have both respected the blue-slip process.

In 2009, the Democrats controlled the White House and had a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate. Every Senate Republican signed a letter to President Obama urging him to respect the blue-slip process. I would like to read a passage from that letter for emphasis.

> Regretfully, if we are not consulted on, and approve of, a nominee from our states, the Republican Conference will be unable to support moving forward on that nominee.
>
> Despite press reports that the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee now may be considering changing the Committee's practice of observing senatorial courtesy, we, as a Conference, expect it to be observed evenhandedly and regardless of party affiliation. And we will act to preserve this principle and the rights of our colleagues if it is not.
>
> Because of the profound impact that life-tenured federal judges can have in our society, the founders made their appointment a shared constitutional responsibility.

This is the Republican conference asking the Democratic majority, the Democratic President, and the chair of the Judiciary Committee to observe the blue-slip process.

President Obama, and the Democratic majority at that time, upheld the blue-slip process without exception. Last year, the Judiciary Committee held a nomination hearing for David Stras to serve on the Eighth Circuit despite his not receiving two positive blue-slips from his home State Senators. This is the first time since the early years of the George W. Bush administration that the Judiciary Committee has held a hearing for a nominee when a home State Senator has not returned a blue slip. If the Senate proceeds to vote on and confirm Mr. Stras, it will be the first time since 1989 and only the third time in the last 100 years that a judicial nominee will be confirmed without having two positive blue slips.

I, certainly, take the chairman at his word that this was a onetime exception to the blue-slip process, but I will hold him and the President to the same standard they demanded from President Obama in 2009.

I will continue to rigorously defend the Senate's constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on lifetime appointees to the Federal bench. Until we return to a normal process through which we can provide this kind of advice and consent, I will continue to oppose invoking cloture on any judicial nominee, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in this position.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO JEFF COOK

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, every week, I try to come down to the floor and talk a little bit about my State and do a little bit of bragging in what we call our ''Alaskan of the Week'' series. Now, there is a lot to talk about with regard to Alaska. We would love for the people in the Gallery and the people who are watching to come out and visit our great State. It will be the trip of a lifetime. The scenery, of course, is gorgeous, and the mountains are rugged, but it is really the people who make my State so special—rugged, self-sufficient, kind, and very generous people all across an area that is over two and one-half times the size of Texas.

I apologize to my Texas colleagues, as they get a little upset when I talk about that, but it is true.

Every week, we have been recognizing a group or a person who has worked to make Alaska a stronger place, a stronger community—a State that, I think, is the best State in our great Nation. I call these individuals our Alaskans of the Week.

Today, I take all who are watching to Alaska's interior, to a town called Fairbanks, AK, where about 32,000 of my fellow Alaskans live. It is a beautiful, wonderful place. Fairbanks is hot in the summer. My wife and I were married there many years ago. It was over 90 degrees when we got married in August, but it is really cold in the winter. We spent January 1, 2000—the millennium celebration—in Fairbanks with our kids and our family. It was 50 below zero without the windchill—cold. It is a place I love, where my wife was born and raised, where we lived, where my in-laws still live, and the place Jeff Cook, our Alaskan of the Week, calls home.

Jeff has been in Fairbanks his whole life. His parents moved to Fairbanks in 1938. He went to college in Oregon, and his wife Sue was there, but the couple moved back to Alaska, to Fairbanks, and started a family. He is now 74 years young. He and Sue have four children, two of whom have settled in Fairbanks, and they have five grandchildren. He is the patriarch of not only a great family but of many community organizations throughout Fairbanks and, really, Alaska.

Throughout the years, Jeff has had a career in real estate, in business. He has sat on numerous boards—community boards—and been in community groups. Let me just give a couple of examples of his community work, of his sitting on the board of the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce, the University of Alaska Board of Regents, the Rotary Club of Fairbanks, the Greater Fairbanks Community Hospital Foundation board, the board for the State of Alaska Chamber of Commerce, the Rasmuson Foundation board, and the boards for Alaska Airlines and Wells Fargo Bank. This is an individual—a leader—who has been involved in his community for decades. He is a perfect example of the community-minded individual whom we call our Alaskan of the Week.

We could be done right here. It is a pretty amazing career—a great example of someone who is dedicated to his State, to his country, to his community. Yet Jeff has done a lot more. He recently used all of his energy, all of his experience, all of his community involvement to embark on what really has become an extraordinary fundraising campaign to raise money for cancer research—so important for our Nation, so important for Alaska. This became a personal issue for Jeff. Let me tell you this story.

Last March, he and Sue received, really, a devastating phone call from their youngest daughter Chrissy, who is 34 and lives in Las Vegas with her husband and 2-year-old daughter. She called to tell them the bad news—really, the horrible news that millions of American families hear every year—that she had been diagnosed with breast cancer and that she had a positive match for the BRCA2 gene, which increases one's risk of developing breast cancer or ovarian cancer.

Jeff and Sue felt powerless against this disease when they heard this. He said: ''When you're a parent, it doesn't matter how old your children are; you're supposed to slay the dragons and conquer the monsters'' and protect your kids.

If that were not devastating enough, weeks later, he and his wife made sure that everyone in the Cook family got tested. Unfortunately, five other members of the family tested positive for this gene. They are all being monitored now.

Here is what Jeff said: ''We couldn't conquer the cancer, but we just had to do something.'' He said he had heard about the American Cancer Society's ''Real Men Wear Pink'' campaign—a fundraising program that is held in October. October, as everybody knows, is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. About 3,000 men from across the country participated in the program this year, the ''Real Men Wear Pink'' campaign.

So Jeff started. He started with the pretty impressive goal of raising $5,000 for cancer research and an email list of about 70 people, most of whom were in Fairbanks. Within 90 seconds after sending his first email, he had raised $1,000. Pretty good. Then what happened? The community of Fairbanks, of Alaska—really of the whole country—started opening up to his plea. Donations kept coming in. The more donations he received, the more Jeff worked at raising funds. Many of the people he knew were donating, but what happened? Strangers from across Alaska and from across the country started to send money for this very worthy cause of breast cancer research—often with heartfelt stories of their loved ones, of their own struggles with cancer, or of those of their kids. Someone from a small town in New York State sent him $250.

As the weeks passed, he began to pay attention to how he was stacking up against others across the country. Jeff is a competitive guy. He is very successful. When he reached No. 10 in the country in terms of fundraising for this very important matter, he told one of his friends there was no way he could beat the No. 1 person ahead of him who had raised $30,000—no way. That was a high number. Now, Fairbanks is not a very big city, and the other people on the list above him were from much bigger cities from across the country and had what he thought were larger connections and larger networks. Yet his friend told him: ''Don't underestimate yourself, Jeff.'' After he read that, he said: ''Okay. I'm going for broke.'' This is what he did.

He was all in. He started fundraising everywhere. When it was all said and done, on this campaign, Jeff Cook, from Fairbanks, AK—a town of a little over 30,000 people in Alaska's interior—was the No. 1 fundraiser in America for breast cancer research this year—No. 1. In terms of the American Cancer Society's ''Real Men Wear Pink'' campaign, Jeff Cook raised over $120,000.

If my colleagues were down here, I would ask them for a round of applause.

That was for the entire country. Think about that. We come down to this floor a lot and debate cancer research, medical research—very important. Here is one individual in America who raised over $120,000 through his own energy and passion and for the love of his daughter. This is a testament to Jeff's perseverance, but it is also about the good people in Fairbanks, throughout Alaska, and really throughout the country.

As Jeff said, ''It says so much about our community. There was such an outpouring of love, goodness and generosity. That was the most touching part of [this entire experience].''

What else did Jeff learn? He learned that his daughter Chrissy, who underwent chemotherapy and a double mastectomy, is stronger than he ever imagined. She is recovering well, but she is still in recovery.

I am going to humbly ask my colleagues and those who are watching here and those who are watching on TV to put a prayer in for Chrissy and other cancer victims like Senator HIRONO, who was just on the floor. Put them on your prayer lists as they are in recovery—all of them.

I want to end with a big thanks to everybody in Alaska and across the country who are part of the ''Real Men Wear Pink'' campaign who are literally raising hundreds of thousands of dollars for breast cancer research.

I thank Jeff, of course, for not underestimating himself but for another—another—mission well done as a community leader in Fairbanks and throughout Alaska.

Congratulations for being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would have joined Senator SULLIVAN in a round of applause. I thank him for sharing that inspiring story.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon just to talk very briefly about the real-world impacts of the decisions we are going to make in the next week or so regarding the future of the budget and to really implore my Republican colleagues here, most especially the Republican leadership, to get this job done and not put us on another continuing resolution. This is not a theoretical or a rhetorical exercise; this is about people's lives and our failure to do our job—our failure to pass a budget and to extend lifesaving programs, like the Children's Health Insurance Program. It is not about politics, and it is not about headlines. It is not about point scoring. It is about making people's lives better.

I really just want to share three stories from Connecticut to talk about the impact of the decisions that we are going to make with respect to the Federal budget. Let me first talk about this often esoteric-sounding concept of parity. One of the most important things that we are discussing is how many additional dollars are going to be in the budget for 2017 and 2018 versus in the prior fiscal year.

There seems to be fairly widespread agreement that we are underresourced when it comes to the Department of Defense. We have a multitude of kinetic challenges that are presented to the United States. A group of us just got briefed, once again today, by our military leadership on the scope and extent of the North Korean threat. I agree with many of my Republican colleagues that we need to increase funding for national security, but national security is not just housed in the Department of Defense. National security is also about making sure that our families are secure and that our communities are secure.

We believe that we should increase funds for the Department of Defense, and we should also make sure that our schools have teachers. We should also make sure that we have cops on the streets. We should also make sure that our bridges aren't falling down. That is national security as well. It is not too much to ask to make sure that our security is taken care of internationally and domestically as well.

Let me give you a perfect example of how you can't just plus-up defense spending and leave the rest of the budget unattended to. We love defense spending in Connecticut. Why? Because we make a lot of big ticket items for the Department of Defense. We make the helicopters at Sikorsky. We make the jet engines at Pratt & Whitney. We make the submarines at Electric Boat.

We are proud of all of them, but let me tell you what happens at Electric Boat if you plus-up the Defense Department at the expense of all of the other discretionary accounts. We are going to be building a lot more submarines over the next 10 years. We are now building two fast attack submarines a year. We are going to start building the new ballistic submarines, the *Columbia* class, and Electric Boat needs to hire 14,000 employees over the next 10 years. Much of that is because their workforce is older, and so they are going to have a lot of retirements. They have to find 14,000 new employees over the next 10 years. If they can't, we cannot make the submarines in the United States, or we cannot make the parts that go into

the submarines in the United States. Either the job will not get done, or the work will happen somewhere else in another country. You can't assemble the submarines anywhere other than at Electric Boat, but those parts will go to foreign companies rather than American companies.

The way in which we are going to fill the 14,000 jobs is through the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor has a partnership with an organization called the Eastern Connecticut Manufacturing Pipeline. That is a public-private partnership that seeks to train hundreds of individuals in the skills necessary to build the submarines. They received 4,500 applications over the past year. They can't place all those people because they only get a certain amount of funding from the Department of Labor, but they were able to train 500 new workers for Electric Boat, putting them right into those jobs that are necessary to build these submarines. The problem is the money for that program is running out, and with another CR, they can't get renewed funding for that program. So if you plus-up the Defense Department without increasing funding for the Department of Labor, you can't get the stuff that you want to build for the Department of Defense because you can't get the workers in order to fill the contracts.

If you don't renew this contract, if you don't renew this funding agreement with the Eastern Connecticut Manufacturing Pipeline, the work will not get done, and the jobs will go overseas. I just want my colleagues to understand that this isn't some philosophical belief that we need the same amount of money in the Department of Defense as we need in the rest of the budget. It is practical. It is practical because we need domestic economic security, but you also can't execute the Department of Defense contracts without funding in the rest of the budget.

Second, let me talk to you about the real-world implications of not funding the Children's Health Insurance Program. You know that healthcare more than any other issue has become a political football. Democrats toss it to the Republicans, and Republicans toss it back to Democrats. Yet there is no other issue that is more personal than this. If someone doesn't have healthcare for their family, nothing else in their life can happen.

I want to share one story. These letters and emails are flooding into our offices with respect to the real-world impact of not funding the Children's Health Insurance Program.

In Connecticut, letters have gone out to families whose children are insured through CHIP, telling them that by the end of this month—that is 20 days away—they lose their insurance. So here is what Tara from Washington, CT, writes. She said:

Despite our full time employment—

She works as a small business manager, and her husband is a full-time electrical apprentice—

my husband and I do not make enough money to buy health insurance for our children in addition to our other mandatory expenses.

She explains that her children go to daycare, which costs $1,800 a month, which she says is more than their mortgage plus taxes and insurance.

To go back to her letter, she says:

This is where the [Children's Health Insurance Program] comes into play in our lives. I cannot even begin to tell you the anxiety I faced when I was pregnant with my daughter, crying every day because I didn't know how we were going to make ends meet. Thank God for a family friend who happened to be an insurance agent. She told us about [CHIP] and suddenly some of that anxiety was quelled.

We have been blessed to have [CHIP] in our lives.

I say CHIP. She says in the letter HUSKY. HUSKY is the name of the CHIP program in Connecticut.

We have been blessed to have [CHIP] in our lives. Last month my daughter got RSV and was prescribed a nebulizer. Two weeks ago, my son caught it from her and that developed into a double ear infection and pink eye, requiring two expensive medications. The co-pays and premiums are manageable though and they got the care they needed.

I read in the [local paper] this weekend that letters were going out to parents of children . . . telling them that their coverage will end on January 31, 2018.

She is writing this in December.

We are a week away from Christmas, and what should be a happy time of year has now turned into stress and depression. How am I going to get insurance for my kids? My daughter turns two on February 10th, how am I going to pay for her well visit? I can't just skip it, they won't allow her back into daycare.

I cannot believe the dysfunction going on in this country. I cannot believe tax cuts for the wealthy have taken precedent over the health of my kids. . . . What is Congress doing to ensure their continued healthcare?

This story is repeated literally millions of times over all across this country. People went through the holiday anxious and depressed because they were convinced that we weren't taking seriously the healthcare of their kids. When we debate the budget, it has to have attached to it a long-term, if not permanent, extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program because there are families just like Tara out there who are doing everything we ask them to. She is full-time employed, her husband is full-time employed, and they can't afford health insurance for their kids without CHIP.

Let me talk to you about the importance of making sure that we get the right amount of disaster funding to Texas, Florida, and in particular Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico matters to us in Connecticut because we have the largest percentage of our population with Puerto Rican roots than any State in the country. We are so proud of that. The Puerto Rican community in Connecticut is vibrant, economically and culturally, powerful politically, involved in our cities and towns and in State government.

The Governor of Puerto Rico has requested $94 billion for Maria recovery and rebuilding, and I am just back from Puerto Rico. I can report to you that the island is still in crisis. One hundred days after the hurricane hit, more than half of the country—half of the households—still don't have electricity.

If that were happening in Connecticut, Alaska, or Louisiana, there would be riots in the streets, but for some reason it is acceptable in Puerto Rico. We are 100 days after the hurricane, and we still haven't approved a disaster recovery package, and the Trump administration is nickel-anddiming the island.

I walked through the poorest, most densely populated neighborhood in San Juan, the capital of the Commonwealth. They have no power. Mold is growing in these homes because they can't dry out the moisture without electricity. Kids are enduring more frequent and more intense bouts of asthma. People are dying because they can't refrigerate their medication or keep their ventilation equipment running. This is what is happening in the United States of America. We need to authorize significant, robust funding for Puerto Rico and for Texas and Florida. We need to do it now.

We need to do it now because the day that I arrived on the island—I think it was January 2—it was reported to us that there was the highest volume of people leaving Puerto Rico since the hurricane—on that day, January 2. The exodus is getting more intense. More people are leaving, not less. Why? Because they don't think we are committed to rebuilding the island. Puerto Ricans don't think that Congress is serious about putting back on the electricity. They waited 1 month. They waited 2 months. They waited 3 months, and then they said: Enough, we can't put our kids in these conditions.

They started leaving in record numbers. They were leaving right off the bat, but they are now leaving in record numbers. While most of them are coming to places like Florida, many of them are coming to Connecticut. Why? Because when they make that move, they often go first to stay with friends. Because we have such a compassionate, large Puerto Rican community in Connecticut, many of these families are coming to Connecticut.

So let me just give you a couple of the numbers here. We asked our school systems to try to keep a rough track of how many new Puerto Rican students are showing up. Our cities are small in Connecticut. We don't have a city that is much bigger than 100,000. In Hartford, they have 388 new Puerto Rican students—''new'' meaning having come since the hurricane from the island. Waterbury, CT, has 268. New Britain, a very small city, has 213. Bridgeport has 179. These are kids who are glad to have shelter and schooling in Connecticut, but they don't want to be in Connecticut. They came under duress. They came to Connecticut as refugees. They want to be back in Puerto Rico.

The stress that this is putting on the schools is serious. We are in a budget crisis in Connecticut. Schools have already had their funding cut from Hartford. Yet these schools are now having to staff up to deal with this influx of students from Puerto Rico. We are glad to do it. We see it as our obligation, and we know that these kids will be a part of Connecticut's strength. But it is not easy to do when we haven't authorized any money to help States like Connecticut to deal with this influx of students. At McDonough Middle School in Hartford, these kids are thriving, but they have had to set up a new immersion lab to handle all these kids coming in. They have had to hire new staff to teach English as a second language. These are schools that were already seeing their funding hemorrhage from the State government.

The impact is real on McDonough Middle School. The impact is real on Tara and her family from Washington. The impact is real for an important supplier in our industrial base, Electric Boat. If we just continue to push CR after CR, these families, schools, and companies will not succeed. This isn't about political headlines. This isn't about numbers on a page. This is about real-world impact for businesses, families, and schools.

So let's get the job done. Let's write a budget. Let's at least agree to the overall budget numbers. Let's fund the Children's Health Insurance Program. Let's get Puerto Rico, Florida, and Texas everything they need. News flash: That is our job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO EARL BUSH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Earl Bush, the judge-executive in Bracken County, KY, who will retire at the end of his current term. In my home State, a judge-executive is the highest elected county official, and since 2011, Earl has earned a reputation for accomplishment on behalf of the people of Bracken County.

After graduating from Western Kentucky University, Earl served our Nation in the U.S. Air Force, earning the rank of captain. For the next three decades, Earl worked at Dayton Power and Light in various construction management positions.

In 2010, Earl decided to put his efforts to work for his neighbors because, like so many of us in public life, he wanted to make a difference. Along with his team, Earl has spent his time in office working to help the men and women of Bracken County. As a former county judge-executive myself, I know firsthand about Earl's wide-ranging responsibilities. Looking at his results, Earl seems to have found success.

In addition to equipment upgrades and road improvements, Earl has also championed the addition of recreational trails and a fishing lake at a local industrial park. Working with other officials, Earl also lowered taxes and helped the county's largest employer bring new jobs to Bracken County. By nearly any standard, that is an impressive record of accomplishment for a public official.

I have enjoyed every opportunity I have had to work with Earl. Throughout his time in office, he has been a strong partner as we serve the people of Kentucky. In retirement, Earl looks forward to spending more time with his wife and grandchildren. He also plans to work with his brother to restore classic cars. Along with many in Bracken County, I wish him a relaxing next chapter, and I am confident that my Senate colleagues will join me.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for votes relative to the nominations of Michael Lawrence Brown to be a U.S. district judge for the Northern District of Georgia and Walter David Counts III to be a U.S. district judge for the Western District of Texas.

On vote No. 7, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on confirmation of the Brown nomination.

On vote No. 8, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on the motion to invoke cloture on the Counts nomination.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the votes on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 389, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 435, and the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 435.

On vote No. 7, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 389.

On vote No. 8, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 435.

On vote No. 9, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 435.

Mr. President, I was also necessarily absent for the vote on the motion to proceed to the House message to accompany S. 139.

On vote No. 10, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to proceed to the House message to accompany S. 139.●

250TH ANNIVERSARY OF SANFORD, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the city of Sanford, ME. Sanford was built with a spirit of determination and resiliency that still guides the community today, and this is a time to celebrate the generations of hard-working and caring people who have made it such a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

The year of Sanford's incorporation, 1768, was but one milestone in a long journey of progress, a journey that is inextricably linked to the history of our Nation. In 1661, British Army General William Phillips purchased large tracts of land from two chiefs of local Abenaki Tribes for his growing lumber business. Called Phillipstown, the lands remained largely uninhabited due to the ongoing conflict between England and France for control of the northern American Colonies.

Hostilities in the region ceased in 1739, and the new community grew rapidly, reaching a population of 1,500 within just a few decades. At the time the town was incorporated in 1768, Maine was a province of Massachusetts, and the Governor of Massachusetts used the occasion to honor Peleg Sanford, stepson of William Phillips and former four-term British Governor for the State of Rhode Island.

When the American Colonists fought for independence, Sanford stood with them. The city's cemeteries contain the headstones of 33 patriots who joined freedom's cause.

With the Mousam River providing power, Sanford was home to more than a dozen sawmills and gristmills. In the 1860s, Sanford truly became a city of industry when Thomas Goodall established a massive textile mill that produced everything from material for clothing to railroad car upholstery. Skilled textile workers poured into Sanford from Europe and French Canada, giving the city an international flavor that still exists today.

In the 1950s, the owners of Sanford's textile mills began moving operations to southern States, leaving behind thousands of jobless workers and vast, empty factories. Local business and community leaders responded with the energy and determination that defines the city, traveling throughout the country to entice new employers. Noting this remarkable effort, LIFE magazine called Sanford ''the town that refused to die.'' Today Sanford has a diversified industrial base, from textiles to technology.

Sanford is among Maine's oldest municipalities, but it also is Maine's newest city, having changed its charter from the town form of government to that of a city in 2013. It is also new in the sense of embracing the technology of the future through the construction of both the largest municipally owned broadband network in Maine for economic development and a 50-megawatt solar array for renewable energy generation. The new Academic and Career

Technical High School that will open this summer reaffirms Sanford's commitment to education.

The celebration of Sanford's 250th anniversary is not merely about the passing of time. It is about human accomplishment. We celebrate the people who, for longer than America has been a nation, have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community. Thanks to those who came before, Sanford, ME, has a wonderful history. Thanks to those there today, it has a bright future.

80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SHAWNEE PEAK SKI AREA

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 80th anniversary of the Shawnee Peak Ski Area in Bridgton, ME. Shawnee Peak is the oldest continually operated major ski facility in Maine and possesses natural beauty, which combines with the love of the outdoors and the strong sense of community of the region's residents.

Originally called Pleasant Mountain Ski Area, the facility opened with a rope tow on January 23, 1938. That day of celebration was preceded by many years of hard work by Bridgton's Lions Club and Chamber of Commerce, Bridgton Academy, the Pleasant Mountain Ski Club, and the local Civilian Conservation Corps to plan, raise money, and clear trails. With Maine's Western Mountains providing spectacular views of the Lakes Region and Mount Washington, Pleasant Mountain soon began attracting skiers from throughout New England.

Renamed Shawnee Peak in 1988, the ski area has long been a place of innovation, including the site of Maine's first T-bar and chairlift. Shawnee Peak pioneered night skiing and in the 1970s helped to lead the acrobatic freestyle skiing movement that is now a favorite event in the Winter Olympics. Shawnee Peak also is a leader in offering youth programs in skiing and snowboarding to encourage children to stay active and to challenge themselves.

In 1994, Shawnee Peak was purchased by business leader and entrepreneur Chet Homer and his family. Echoing the conservation ethic that defines our State, Mr. Homer has stated he does not think of himself as owning the mountain, but rather of being its steward.

For 80 years, Shawnee Peak Ski Area has strengthened Maine's skiing industry, spurred economic development in a rural region, and brought families and friends together in wholesome recreation. It is a pleasure to congratulate Chet Homer and his team for the accomplishments of this Maine family business and to wish them continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO DR. HOWARD WILLSON

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I am honored to recognize my friend, Dr. Howard Willson, as Wyoming's 2018 Physician of the Year. Over the course of his distinguished career, Dr. Willson tirelessly worked to improve healthcare in Wyoming. His contributions in medical education, quality improvement, and public health touched countless patients in our State. Outside of medicine, Dr. Willson served Wyoming as member of the University of Wyoming's board of trustees and as an officer in the U.S. Air Force.

In addition to his many professional accomplishments, folks in Basin and Thermopolis simply know Howard as their family doctor. Multiple generations of patients benefited from Howard's caring and compassionate approach to medicine. From Dr. Willson's perspective, being entrusted to care for his neighbors was the highest compliment he could receive.

While Howard Willson made his greatest impact in Wyoming, he was born in the small town of Spring Lake, FL. After completing his undergraduate degree from Florida State University, he was commissioned as an officer in the U.S. Air Force. Howard then attended medical school at the University of Florida and graduated in 1965. After graduation from medical school, he completed his internship at the U.S. Air Force Hospital at Andrews Air Force Base. In total, Dr. Willson served in the Air Force for 10 years, eventually rising to the rank of captain.

Over the next several years, Dr. Willson practiced medicine in Florida, where he served as an active member of the medical community. Then in 1976, he decided to make the move to Wyoming, a decision that has benefited the people of our State ever since. Howard began his practice in the town of Basin and eventually moved to Thermopolis. Once he arrived in Wyoming, Howard not only became a valued doctor, but also an energetic member of the community.

He quickly became active in his county's medical society and in the Wyoming Medical Society, eventually becoming president of the Wyoming Medical Society in 1986. In addition, he was an active leader of the medical staff of two different Wyoming hospitals, South Big Horn County Hospital and Hot Springs County Memorial Hospital.

In addition to his active medical practice, Dr. Willson was passionate about training the next generation of Wyoming healthcare providers. In particular, Howard wanted to introduce medical students to the joys and rewards of working in rural communities. This is why he was an active preceptor in the Wyoming Family Practice program for over 20 years.

To this day, medical students in Wyoming are benefiting from Dr. Willson's passion for medical education. This is because he was vital in bringing the WWAMI medical education program to Wyoming. Folks in Wyoming are now very familiar with this program, which allows students from Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho to attend medical school at the University of Washington. Wyoming joined this unique and highly effective program in 1996. As Professor Joe Steiner, former dean of the University of Wyoming's College of Health Sciences, said, ''Howard Willson was instrumental in bringing WWAMI to Wyoming. He was also a strong supporter of all health care professions and was eager to share his knowledge with students.''

Aside from teaching, Dr. Willson was passionate about improving the quality of healthcare received by Wyoming patients. He served as medical director of Mountain-Pacific Quality Health Foundation-Wyoming. This organization is dedicated to working with Medicare to lower the cost and improve the quality of healthcare. In particular, Howard understood that achieving this goal meant serving as a partner with providers and healthcare facilities. It was through this work that virtually all the patients in Wyoming were helped by Howard's work, even though they never knew it.

Finally, Howard knew the importance of public health in helping keep folks well. He served as the public health officer for Hot Springs County, starting in 2004. It was only with deep regret that the board of commissioners accepted his resignation in 2016. These folks knew what an impact Dr. Willson had made on their community.

Outside of medicine, Howard was always involved in the local communities in which he lived. The Governor of Wyoming appointed Howard to the University of Wyoming's board of trustees. He served the university with distinction from 2003 to 2015. Simply put, all the students of the University of Wyoming benefited from Howard's passion for making sure that everyone in our state could get a great education.

Clearly Howard Willson is one of the most accomplished doctors in the history of Wyoming. I can think of no person more deserving of being our State's Physician of the Year.

In closing, I would like to congratulate Howard, his wife, Belenda, and their six children on this most well-deserved achievement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING MONTANA YOUTH CHALLENGE ACADEMY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing the Montana Youth ChalleNGe Academy (MYCA), located in Dillon, MT. The MYCA is sponsored by the Montana National Guard and the State of Montana and assists at-risk youth in our state to develop the skills necessary to become productive citizens. This academy focuses on the physical, emotional and educational

needs of the youth using a quasi-military style technique of discipline and motivation. To date, they have graduated over two thousand students.

I would like to thank six of the original staff who began work at MYCA when it opened in 1999 and who are still employed there today. Director Jan Rouse, Deputy Director Trent Gibson, Lead Teacher Carolyn Bielser, Lead Counselor Ben Stewart, Counselor Tammy Pittman and Cadre Team Leader Cheryl Miskowic have spent years working to help Montana's at-risk youth and their work has touched the lives of many. Along with the other staff at MYCA, they have helped students become contributing members of our Montana communities. Thank you to all those working hard at the Montana Youth ChalleNGe Academy in Beaverhead County.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 140. An act to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4567. An act to require a Department of Homeland Security overseas personnel enhancement plan, and for other purposes.

At 12:40 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, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 139. An act to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4567. An act to require a Department of Homeland Security overseas personnel enhancement plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4027. A communication from the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of the Comptroller's 2017 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4028. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Financial Stability Oversight Council, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Freedom of Information Act Regulations'' (12 CFR Part 1301) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4029. A communication from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Director for Financial Management, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation'' (RIN0605–AA48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4030. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Roadside Safety Hardware Identification Methods''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4031. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report on the continued compliance of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan with the 1974 Trade Act's freedom of emigration provisions, as required under the Jackson-Vanik Amendment; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4032. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to Saudi Arabia in support of the assembly and integration of cannons onto weapons stations in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17–044); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4033. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''New Animal Drugs for Investigational Use; Disqualification of a Clinical Investigator'' ((RIN0910–AH64) (Docket No. FDA–2011–N–0079)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4034. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–219, ''Office on African American Affairs Establishment Act of 2017''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4035. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–220, ''Advanced Practice Registered Nurse Signature Authority Amendment Act of 2017''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4036. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–222, ''Public School Health Services Amendment Act of 2017''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4037. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–223, ''D.C. Healthcare Alliance Re-Enrollment Reform Amendment Act of 2017''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4038. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–224, ''Department of Health Care Finance Independent Procurement Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 2017''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4039. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Joseph D. Brown, of Texas, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas for the term of four years.

Matthew D. Krueger, of Wisconsin, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of four years.

Norman Euell Arflack, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Ted G. Kamatchus, of Iowa, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Iowa for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2293. A bill to amend section 214(c)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the data reporting requirements relating to nonimmigrant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2294. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that individuals may access documentation verifying the monthly housing stipend paid to the individual under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2295. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.0 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 2296. A bill to increase access to agency guidance documents; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 2297. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land to Custer County, South Dakota; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2298. A bill to prohibit oil and gas leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of New England; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 2299. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to provide wildfire regulatory relief, to modify the evaluation of a major disaster declaration request, to provide regulatory relief for banks during major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2300. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 111 Market Street in Saugerties, New York, as the ''Maurice D. Hinchey Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2301. A bill to strengthen parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 2302. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Bureau of Land Management land in Cache County, Utah, to the city of Hyde Park, Utah, for public purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 2303. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to preserve consumer and employer access to licensed independent insurance producers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BURR, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 2304. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to protect veterans from predatory lending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2305. A bill to require a study and report on the housing and service needs of victims of trafficking and individuals at risk for trafficking; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. Res. 372. A resolution congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2017 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HARRIS:

S. Res. 373. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''Korean American Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 515

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) 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.

S. 878

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 878, a bill to establish privacy protections for customers of broadband Internet access service and other telecommunications services.

S. 963

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 963, a bill to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation's social programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. DAINES, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a home infusion therapy services temporary transitional payment under the Medicare program.

S. 1767

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1767, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 1808

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1808, a bill to extend temporarily the Federal Perkins Loan program, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1989

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1989, a bill to enhance transparency and accountability for online political advertisements by requiring those who purchase and publish such ads to disclose information about the advertisements to the public, and for other purposes.

S. 2037

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2037, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding proprietary institutions of higher education in order to protect students and taxpayers.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2054, a bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 to establish a program to provide advance payments under the Emergency Conservation Program for the repair or replacement of fencing.

S. 2152

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2152, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for assistance for victims of child pornography, and for other purposes.

S. 2235

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2235, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

S. RES. 367

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was

added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 367, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its violence against demonstrators and calling for peaceful resolution to the concerns of the citizens of Iran.

S. RES. 368

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 368, a resolution supporting the right of all Iranian citizens to have their voices heard.

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 368, supra.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 372—CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2017 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 372

Whereas the North Dakota State University (referred to in this preamble as ''NDSU'') Bison won the 2017 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''NCAA'') Division I Football Championship Subdivision (referred to in this preamble as the ''FCS'') title game in Frisco, Texas, on January 6, 2018, in a victory over the James Madison University Dukes by a score of 17 to 13;

Whereas NDSU has now won 14 NCAA championships;

Whereas NDSU has now won its sixth NCAA Division I FCS championship in 7 years, an extraordinary achievement;

Whereas NDSU has now tied the record for most NCAA Division I FCS championships with 6 in only 10 years of eligibility;

Whereas the NDSU Bison have displayed tremendous resilience and skill over the past 7 seasons, with 97 wins to only 8 losses, including a streak of 33 consecutive wins;

Whereas estimates state that more than 13,000 Bison fans attended the championship game, reflecting the tremendous spirit and dedication of Bison Nation that has helped propel the success of the team; and

Whereas the 2017 NCAA Division I FCS championship was a victory not only for the NDSU football team, but also for the entire State of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the North Dakota State University Bison football team as the 2017 champions of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision;

(2) commends the North Dakota State University players, coaches, and staff for—

(A) their hard work and dedication on a historic season; and

(B) fostering a continuing tradition of athletic and academic excellence; and

(3) recognizes the students, alumni, and loyal fans that supported the Bison while the Bison sought to capture a sixth Division I Football Championship Subdivision championship for North Dakota State University.

SENATE RESOLUTION 373—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF ''KOREAN AMERICAN DAY''

Ms. HARRIS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 373

Whereas the influence of Korean Americans may be observed in all facets of life in the United States, including politics, industry, entrepreneurship, volunteerism, the arts, and education;

Whereas 102 courageous Korean immigrants arrived in the United States on January 13, 1903, initiating the first chapter of Korean immigration to the United States, the land of opportunity;

Whereas these pioneer Korean immigrants faced tremendous social and economic obstacles as well as language barriers in the United States;

Whereas in pursuit of the American dream, Korean immigrants initially served as farmworkers, wage laborers, and section hands throughout the United States;

Whereas, through resilience, tenacious effort, and immense sacrifice, first generation Korean immigrants established a new home in a new land that became the home for future generations of Korean Americans;

Whereas the centennial year of 2003 marked an important milestone in the history of Korean immigration;

Whereas the House of Representatives passed House Resolution 487 to commemorate ''Korean American Day'' in the 109th Congress;

Whereas the Senate passed Senate Resolution 283 to commemorate ''Korean American Day'' in the 109th Congress;

Whereas, just as other immigrants before them, Korean Americans—

(1) came to the United States seeking opportunity and a better life; and

(2) have thrived in the United States due to strong work ethic, family bonds, and community spirit;

Whereas Korean Americans have made significant contributions to the economic vitality of the United States and the global marketplace;

Whereas Korean Americans have invigorated businesses, nonprofit organizations and other nongovernmental organizations, government, technology, medicine, athletics, arts and entertainment, journalism, religious communities, academic communities, and countless other facets of society in the United States;

Whereas Korean Americans have made enormous contributions to the military strength of the United States and served with distinction in the Armed Forces during World War I, World War II, and the conflict in Korea;

Whereas South Korea will host the 2018 Winter Olympics in PyeongChang, South Korea; and

Whereas the Centennial Committees of Korean Immigration and Korean Americans have designated January 13 of each year as ''Korean American Day'' to commemorate the first step of the long and prosperous journey of Korean Americans in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of ''Korean American Day'';

(2) urges the people of the United States to observe ''Korean American Day'' so as to have a greater appreciation of the invaluable contributions that Korean Americans have made to the United States; and

(3) honors and recognizes the 115th anniversary of the arrival of the first Korean immigrants to the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1870. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

SA 1871. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1870 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 139, supra.

SA 1872. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 139, supra.

SA 1873. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1872 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 139, supra.

SA 1874. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1873 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 1872 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 139, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1870. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.''

SA 1871. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1870 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''

SA 1872. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.''

SA 1873. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1872 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid

DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''

SA 1874. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1873 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 1872 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike ''4'' and insert ''5''

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I have 3 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 FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 11, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''U.S. Policy in Syria Post-ISIS''.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 11, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on S. 2152 the ''Amy, Vicky, and Any Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act'' and on the following nominations: Stuart Kyle Duncan, of Louisiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 11, 2018, at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing a closed roundtable.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Laura Carey, who is a fellow on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff, on loan from the State Department, during today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114–196, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission: Rosa G. Rios of Maryland.

CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2017 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 372, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 372) congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2017 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 372) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO AWARD THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO JOHN L. CANLEY FOR ACTS OF VALOR DURING THE VIETNAM WAR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4641, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4641) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4641) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 2018, AND TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 2018

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for a pro forma session only, with no business being conducted, on Friday, January 12, at 1 p.m., and that following the pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until Tuesday, January 16, at 4:30 p.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 139; further, that the filing deadlines under rule XXII with respect to the cloture motion filed during today's session regarding the House message to accompany S. 139 be at the following times on Tuesday, January 16: 4:45 p.m. for all first-degree amendments and 5:15 p.m. for all second-degree amendments; finally, that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M. TOMORROW

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:29 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 12, 2018, at 1 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 11, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL LAWRENCE BROWN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA.

WALTER DAVID COUNTS III, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING DR. DAVID ARBUTINA FOR HIS SERVICE TO TYRONE REGIONAL HEALTH NETWORK AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS IN THE CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA REGION

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize David Arbutina, MD, FACS, Founder and Medical Director of Tyrone Regional Health Network's Breast Cancer & Women's Health Institute.

Dr. Arbutina is a board certified general surgeon with a focused area of expertise in breast cancer surgery. He is a Fellow in the American College of Surgeons and a retired Colonel of the United States Air Force.

During his military career, Dr. Arbutina served at United States Air Force bases in Japan and California. He served as Chief of Surgery and Chief of Hospital Services in Japan at Misawa Air Base. He also served as the Commander of the second largest department of surgery in the Air Force at Travis Air Force Base.

Dr. Arbutina is a nationally recognized educator and leader in surgery. Since 1988, he has dedicated his career to the treatment of breast cancer and has personally treated over 1,000 breast cancer patients.

As Medical Director of the Breast Cancer & Women's Health Institute, he has provided educational programs in the community and authored articles on breast health and breast cancer topics to educate community members and raise breast health awareness.

Dr. Arbutina is recognized for his unwavering commitment to educate women on breast health issues and provide guidance to empower them with the knowledge they need to make the right decision regarding their care.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Wednesday, January 10, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of S. 140.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANK NAPOLITANO

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise, along with my colleagues, Congressman PETE AGUILAR, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, Congresswoman NANETTE BARRAGÁN, Congressman AMI BERA, Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY, Congressman SALUD CARBAJAL, Congressman TONY CÁRDENAS, Congresswoman JUDY CHU, Congressman LOU CORREA, Congressman JIM COSTA, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, Congressman MARK DESAULNIER, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, Congressman JIMMY GOMEZ, Congressman JARED HUFFMAN, Congressman RO KHANNA, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Congressman TED LIEU, Congressman ALAN LOWENTHAL, Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI, Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY, Congresswoman GRACE NAPOLITANO, Congressman JIMMY PANETTA, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI, Congressman SCOTT PETERS, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Congressman RAUL RUIZ, Congresswoman LINDA SÁNCHEZ, Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, Congressman BRAD SHERMAN, Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, Congressman ERIC SWALWELL, Congressman MARK TAKANO, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, Congresswoman NORMA TORRES, Congressman JUAN VARGAS, and Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, to honor the extraordinary life of Frank Napolitano, husband of U.S. Congresswoman GRACE FLORES NAPOLITANO and longtime Norwalk community leader and activist.

Frank Napolitano was born and raised in New York City, where he spent his formative years, before military service and moving to California. He was a successful chef, restaurateur and businessman for over two decades. He met and later married the former Grace Flores Musquiz in 1982 and began a post-business career as a prominent community volunteer and philanthropist.

Frank Napolitano rose to become a highly recognized leader with the City of Norwalk where he served for many years as Chairman and member of the Senior Citizens Advisory Commission; he was designated Citizen of the Year by the Norwalk Community Coordinating Council; and prior to that served on the city Parks and Recreation Commission. He also served as an officer and member of several civic and fraternal organizations including the Norwalk Knights of Columbus as a Fourth Degree Member and the Norwalk Lions Club as a Melvin Jones Award recipient.

It was during these many years that he worked tirelessly on several important community benevolent projects including distributing thousands of turkeys and food baskets to families in need during the holiday seasons. He was instrumental in organizing many community carnivals and fairs on behalf of the city and service organizations at the City Hall Lawn to raise much needed funds for their community projects.

Frank's commitment to community service, led to his most significant and long-lasting program, the Norwalk Santa's Sleigh Foundation. Together with Norwalk Mayor Luigi Vernola and Vernola's daughter Lisa Salas, they cofounded the annual Santa's Sleigh visitation program in 1989 in cooperation with the City, Los Angeles County Fire and Sheriff's Departments to distribute toys and goodies to Norwalk Youth and Families throughout the Christmas and holiday season. This award winning program has been imitated by numerous cities and has provided countless families with extra Christmas spirit for decades.

In recognition for his business acumen and community service, Napolitano was appointed to the California state Senate Insurance Committee Advisory Commission on Small Business in 1988. He served for several years advising on the effects of insurance industry practices on small businesses. He left the commission upon the election of his wife Grace to the California State Assembly in 1992.

Frank Napolitano was the constant protector and provider for his large combined family which today has grown to four generations including children, grandchildren and great grandchildren, also his son Louis Napolitano of New York. Frank was the bedrock of continuous support for his beloved wife throughout her career that began with service on Norwalk City International Friendship Commission, later elected to the Norwalk City Council, the California state Assembly and for the past twenty years as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives serving for ten terms in Congress.

Today, The California Democratic Congressional Delegation salutes and honors an outstanding husband, father and civil servant, Mr. Frank Napolitano. We will join all of Frank's loved ones in celebrating his incredible life. He will be deeply missed.

KAZAKHSTAN'S ROLE IN GLOBAL AND REGIONAL SECURITY

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the important role Kazakhstan plays in ensuring regional and global security.

Since declaring its independence from the former Soviet Union in 1991, Kazakhstan has shown its leadership in nuclear disarmament by working with the United States to eliminate regional nuclear weapons stockpiles. From the closure of the Semipalatinsk Test Site in 1991 to the opening of Kazakhstan's Nuclear Security Training Center in 2017, the country has demonstrated its leadership in strengthening international security through promoting nonproliferation in the region.

Kazakhstan's commitment to nuclear security extends past non-proliferation, as the country also promotes safe nuclear power to support the needs of the international community. The U.S. recently supported Kazakhstan's offer to host the world's first low-enriched uranium bank, which will help to guarantee that all nations have an energy source for peaceful civilian nuclear power. Affordable energy is a prerequisite for modernization in Central Asia, and future access

to safe energy sources will help promote stability, development, and prosperity in the region.

Kazakhstan has also been a strong U.S. partner in our efforts to combat terrorism and extremism in the region—particularly in Afghanistan. Under the leadership of President Nazarbayev, Kazakhstan has continued to provide indispensable aid to U.S. troops in Afghanistan. They have not only helped assist the Afghan National Security Forces to promote security and stability, but have also contributed to the Northern Distribution Network. I look forward to President Nazarbayev's visit to the United States and a healthy exchange of ideas about how our government can work with Kazakhstan in promoting human rights and the rule of law.

At a time when the world is increasingly unstable due to the rise of non-state actors and conflicts across the Middle East, Kazakhstan has proven itself as a reliable U.S. partner in the region—one we can count on to advance our shared goals. As Kazakhstan serves on the United Nations Security Council, it is my belief that there is a bright future ahead for our collaboration in advancing peace and security.

HONORING MR. SAMUEL K. BEAMON, SR.

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sam Beamon, a native of Waterbury, Connecticut. The Waterbury Fellowship of Christian Churches will be recognizing Sam at their annual Martin Luther King, Jr. Service for Sam's lifelong commitment to public service and his leadership in Connecticut's African American community. Sam has spent his career in service to others both in the military and as a civilian, and his dedicated work and perpetually friendly demeanor have made him an instrumental and beloved member of the Waterbury community.

Sam's interest in serving his country began at a young age, and he joined the Young Marines in 1960. He later served in the United States Marine Corps during the Vietnam War and earned numerous commendations for his service, including 16 Air Medals, the Combat Action Ribbon, and the Good Conduct Medal. Upon returning to Connecticut, Sam joined the Waterbury Police Department in 1970 and rose through the department's ranks to fill a number of important roles, as well as stepping into a vital role as an advocate for African Americans and breaking down institutional racial barriers. During his nearly three-decade career with the Department, Sam worked as an Accident Investigator, a radar operator, and on the SWAT Team.

Throughout his career and after his retirement, Sam has also been active in a number of civic organizations and causes. He has been an advocate for veterans in Waterbury and across Connecticut, and, in 2014, Sam became the chairman of the Waterbury Veteran's Memorial Committee. He has also worked to improve the lives of and opportunities for young people, particularly those who face socioeconomic challenges, to pursuing meaningful opportunities to engage with their community.

Mr. Speaker, Sam Beamon has spent his life in service to his country and community, and it is proper that we honor him on MLK Day for his countless contributions. I consider myself lucky to have had the opportunity to work with Sam and even luckier to count him among my friends.

TRAFFICKING AND OTHER VICTIMS' RIGHTS GROUPS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following list of trafficking and other victims' rights groups:

1. American Society of Victimology
2. Futures Without Violence
3. International Organization for Victims Assistance (IOVA)
4. Justice for Children
5. Justice Solutions
6. National Alliance to End Sexual Violence (NAESV)
7. National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards (NACVCB)
8. National Association of Victim Assistance Administrators (NAVAA)
9. National Center for Victims of Crime
10. National Chapter of Parents of Murdered Children (NCPOMC)
11. National Children's Alliance (NCA)
12. National Criminal Justice Association
13. National Crime Victim Law Institute
14. National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV)
15. National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)
16. National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA)
17. Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN)
18. Security on Campus
19. Stop Child Predators
20. Witness Justice
21. Shared Hope
22. Penelope's House
23. Center for Child Protection and Family Support
24. Texas Association Against Sexual Assault
25. Texas Council on Family Violence
26. Rights4Girls
27. PROTECT
28. National Network 4 Youth
29. Children at Risk
30. Justice Fellowship
31. Community Action Stops Abuse (CASA)
32. SEARCH
33. End Child Prostitution and Trafficking (ECPAT–USA)
34. Demand Abolition
35. Equality Now
36. Polaris
37. State/Peace Corps Victims Advisory Board
38. Tahirih
39. National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC)
40. Foster Family-based Treatment Association
41. Silence is not Compliance
42. Thorn
43. Coalition to Abolish Slavery & Trafficking (CAST)
44. Love 146
45. Saving Innocence
46. Hope for Justice
47. Breaking Free
48. Hope Against Trafficking
49. Not for Sale
50. Run 2 Rescue
51. Slavery Footprint
52. Truckers Against Trafficking
53. 8th Day Center for Justice
54. Free the Slaves
55. Physicians for Human Rights
56. Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women
57. Save the Children
58. United Against Human Trafficking
59. HEAL Trafficking: Health, Education, Advocacy, Linkage
60. Alliance to End Slavery and Trafficking
61. Courtney's House
62. Stop Child Slavery
63. Freedom Place
64. Clery Center for Security on Campus
65. Children's Assessment Center
66. Ending Child Slavery at the Source
67. Covenant House
68. Joy International
69. International Safe Travels Foundation
70. Arc of Hope
71. Voices of Justice
72. My Life My Choice
73. Fair Girls
74. Colors of Hope
75. Pearls Inc.
76. Zoe Children's Home
77. Phantom Rescue
78. Anti-Slavery
79. Bryan's House
80. New Life, New Hope
81. #HelpErase
82. Dallas LIFE Shelter
83. Stop the Traffik
84. Generation Freedom
85. Nest Foundation
86. Restore NYC
87. The End It Movement
88. The Exodus Road
89. Tiny Hands International
90. Everyone's Kids
91. For the Sake of One
92. Hagar International
93. Fast 21
94. Traffick911
95. Free the Captives
96. Beauty from Ashes
97. Gems
98. Her Resiliency
99. Amnesty International
100. Pillars of Hope

SAFER STREETS ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Safer Streets Act which creates a new grant program that focuses on violent crime in our local communities. Reducing violent crime should be a priority for the federal government.

In my district 228 people were killed in 2016. The deadliest year in two decades. In

2017, 200 people were killed. That is 200 people too many. Cities like Memphis were able to reduce violent crimes by hiring more police and providing programs to help children in the city. It is important that local governments that are trying to reduce violent crimes get federal assistance.

That is why I am introducing the Safer Streets Act. This bill would create a new grant program that would provide grants to units of local government that have crime rates significantly above the national rate. Units of local governments with crime rates four times the national rate would get 50 percent of the funds, units of local governments with crime rates three times the national rate would get 20 percent of the funds, and units of local governments with crime rates two times the national rate would get 10 percent of the funds. This bill also creates an emergency fund for units of local governments that have spikes of violent crimes.

I urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation and support our local communities as they work to reduce violent crime.

HONORING CAPTAIN WALTER COMBS ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to congratulate Palm Springs Police Captain Walter Combs on his retirement after more than 23 years in law enforcement. His dedication to ensuring the residents of Palm Springs are safe is truly commendable. Today, I want to recognize his outstanding accomplishments and years of service.

Captain Combs is an exceptional leader in our local community. He began his law enforcement career serving as a patrol officer with the Indio Police Department. After five years, in 1994, Captain Combs started working with the Palm Springs Police Department where he remained until 2017.

His commitment to keeping our citizens safe earned him many promotions over the years, going from patrol officer to Captain. During his early years with the Palm Springs Police Department, he served as an undercover Narcotics Task Force Officer, field Training Officer, Police Department Honors Guard, and member of the SWAT Team. In 2005, he was promoted to Sergeant and supervised the Patrol Officers, the Detective Bureau overseeing the Property Crimes Division, the auxiliary Peer Support Group and Honor Guard, and the volunteer unit of citizens on Patrol. His determination and outstanding performance eventually led him to be promoted to Lieutenant in 2012, and ultimately to Captain in 2014.

Captain Combs commitment to public service is inspiring. While serving with the Palm Springs Police Department, he was also a devoted member of the Human Rights Commission board and the LGBT Committee.

Captain Combs has dedicated his life in service of the residents of Palm Springs. His valuable contributions and arduous work strengthening our community will be felt for years to come.

On behalf of the entire 36th Congressional District, I am humbled to honor and recognize Captain Walter Combs. I extend my sincerest congratulations on his accomplishments and years of public service. I wish him all the best on his well-deserved retirement.

H.R. 3731, SECRET SERVICE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT OF 2017

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3731, the Secret Service Recruitment and Retention Act of 2017.

The United States Secret Service is operating under tremendous demands with very limited resources. The agency is tasked with protecting a large presidential family that travels frequently around the world. This year, members of the Trump family have traveled to Uruguay, the Dominican Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the Republic of Ireland, among other destinations. The Secret Service provides protection on all of these trips, in addition to protecting the president himself, and each of these trips requires the Secret Service to incur significant costs, including travel, lodging, and costs associated with coordinating with local security entities, embassies, and other overseas partners. The Trump family does not reimburse the Federal government for costs associated with protecting family members on these trips, even when they are made in pursuit of the Trump Organization's business interests and to promote the Trump brand.

The scope of the Secret Service's protective mission, along with other agency activities such as investigating and preventing counterfeiting, has created a hole in the agency's budget. At a June 8, 2017, hearing before the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security, Secret Service Director Randolph "Tex" Alles testified that the agency's budget is "$200 million to $300 million a year short of what would be required" to fulfill its protective and investigative missions more effectively.

This bill will not solve the Secret Service's budget gap, but it will prevent Secret Service agents from having to bear the brunt of challenges they did not create. Many Secret Service agents have hit their overtime pay limits and are unable to receive further compensation despite having to work additional hours given the agency's expanded mission. Such a system is unfair to the agents, who work difficult jobs with long shifts and uncompromising schedules even when they are being fairly compensated.

H.R. 3731 would allow the Secret Service to pay agents for hours they have worked, which is the least we can do. I urge the Senate to pass this bill as soon as possible.

CONGRATULATING WTTW'S CHICAGO TONIGHT: THE WEEK IN REVIEW AND JOEL WEISMAN

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate WTTW's Emmy-Award winning series, Chicago Tonight: The Week in Review, on its 40th Anniversary. January 19, 2018 will also mark Mr. Joel Weisman's final appearance as host and senior editor of the program.

Chicago Tonight: The Week in Review is the longest running series in the history of WTTW and a staple of Chicago news media, representing the city's longest running television series with a single host or anchor. Mr. Weisman has been senior editor since the show's inception.

Mr. Weisman is a lifelong Chicagoan and has been with WTTW since 1973, beginning as political editor and commentator on WTTW's nightly news program, The Public News Center. When The Week in Review premiered on January 20, 1978, it served as a 30-minute conversation series. Throughout its four-decade history, Mr. Weisman welcomed hundreds of reporters to his rotating four-person weekly panel long before this format became commonplace in national TV programming. At. Mr. Weisman's insistence, the panelists were nonpartisan and diverse, first representing print and broadcast, and later, digital media.

In 2008, he was deservedly inducted in the Silver Circle of the Chicago/Midwest chapter of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Mr. Joel Weisman for his tireless dedication to WTTW's Chicago Tonight: The Week in Review throughout his long and storied career delivering vital information—and entertainment—to Chicagoans. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Weisman on his invaluable contribution to WTTW and our community's civic dialogue.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF BISHOP JOHN HURST ADAMS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Bishop John Hurst Adams of the African Methodist Episcopal Church (A.M.E.).

Bishop Adams devoted his life to service of the Church and communities across the country. His relationship with the church began as a deacon in 1948, and culminated with the Senior Bishopric from 1988 to his retirement in 2004. In those 50 years of steadfast service to the A.M.E Church, Bishop Adams also stood as a pillar of the African American community in his active work with the Joint Center on Political and Economic Studies, TransAfrica, the King Center Development Board and during his six-year tenure as the President of Paul Quinn College, located in my district. At that

time, he was the youngest person named to the presidency of the College, as well as the youngest college or university president in the nation. He also did extraordinary work as the Founder and Chairman Emeritus of the Conference of National Black Churches. Bishop Adams had a longstanding and dedicated commitment to serving the cause of civil rights, and to bettering the lives of children through education. I personally witnessed his remarkable life and devotion in the fight for justice and I am truly grateful and honored to acknowledge him.

Bishop Adams is survived by his loving wife, Dr. Dolly Deselle Adams, their three children and eight grandchildren, for whom we offer our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to offer my gratitude for the work done by Bishop Adams, and honor his legacy and belief that "the strength of the African American community network allows it to support each other and come together".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, I was unable to vote on Roll Call votes 005 through 013. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Roll Call 005—No; Roll Call 006—No; Roll Call 007—No; Roll Call 008—Yes; Roll Call 009—Yes; Roll Call 010—Yes; Roll Call 011—Yes; Roll Call 012—Yes; and Roll Call 013—Yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, during my medical recovery, I missed the following roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

December 13, 2017
No on Roll Call No. 676
No on Roll Call No. 677
No on Roll Call No. 678
No on Roll Call No. 679
No on Roll Call No. 680
December 14, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 681
No on Roll Call No. 682
Yea on Roll Call No. 683
No on Roll Call No. 684
December 18, 2017
No on Roll Call No. 685
Yea on Roll Call No. 686
Yea on Roll Call No. 687
December 19, 2017
No on Roll Call No. 688
No on Roll Call No. 689
Yea on Roll Call No. 690
Yea on Roll Call No. 691
No on Roll Call No. 692
Yea on Roll Call No. 693
No on Roll Call No. 694
Yea on Roll Call No. 695
December 20, 2017
No on Roll Call No. 697
No on Roll Call No. 698
No on Roll Call No. 699
Yea on Roll Call No. 700
Yea on Roll Call No. 701
No on Roll Call No. 702
Yea on Roll Call No. 703
December 21, 2017
No on Roll Call No. 704
No on Roll Call No. 705
Yea on Roll Call No. 706
Yea on Roll Call No. 707

RECOGNIZING VETRI VELAN AND KATHY SHIELD

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the tremendous advocacy of two UC Berkeley students whose diligent work mobilized graduate students around the country against the greatest tax scam in American history.

When President Trump and Congressional Republicans introduced legislation to reform the tax code, many of us recognized it for what it was—a blatant attempt to provide millionaires and billionaires with large tax breaks, while eliminating many of the provisions that provide the working class and the poor with means to improve their standing in society.

This terrible bill, passed without proper debate and process just before the holidays, will permanently stack the deck in favor of the rich and well-connected. In fact, we know that 83 percent of the bill's benefits go to the richest 1 percent of our society. To pay for these unnecessary tax breaks for the rich, the bill adds more than $1 trillion to the national debt—a debt that our children and generations to come will continue to bear.

In the face of this immoral redistribution of wealth to the rich, people around the country were rightfully outraged, and many of my constituents were strongly opposed to its passage.

In particular, I would like to recognize two of my constituents for their efforts to highlight a particularly damaging section of the original bill, and commend them for their actions to have it removed from the final package.

Soon after the horrible GOP tax bill was introduced, Vetri Velan, a physics PhD student at UC Berkeley, developed an analysis of the bill. With the majority of doctoral and master students receiving institutional or fee waivers, Vetri realized that if tuition remissions were deemed taxable, graduate students could see their tax bill grow by 200 percent. It would also make it harder, and even impossible, for low or middle-income students to attend graduate school.

Vetri partnered with Kathy Shield, a fellow Cal student pursuing a Nuclear Engineering PhD to develop a tax calculator allowing any graduate student to determine their new tax liability under the House proposal. This allowed students to write and call their elected officials with specific information about the negative impact of the new tax bill.

And they didn't stop there. Vetri and Kathy then organized graduate students at UC Berkley and around the country to contact 87 offices in 18 states to express outrage over this provision.

Because of their great work this harmful provision was removed from the final bill. Vetri & Kathy have saved thousands of dollars for graduate students across the country, and have ensured many hard working students will continue to have access to graduate school.

On behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, I'd like to thank Vetri and Kathy for their exceptional work to ensure all students have equal access to higher education, and most importantly for staying woke.

HAPPY 125TH ANNIVERSARY UVALDE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. WILL HURD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 125th Anniversary of Uvalde Volunteer Fire Department, a critical community institution and group of dedicated individuals in South Texas.

The Uvalde Volunteer Fire Department was founded in 1892, just 36 years after Uvalde County was established by Reading Wood Black, a twenty-two year old from New Jersey. In addition to fighting fires and educating the people of Uvalde on fire safety and prevention, this Department regularly participates in community events, like the Newspapers in Education and Christmas Posada and Parade, truly going the extra mile for public service.

Today I applaud the countless members of the Uvalde Volunteer Fire Department who have helped to keep Uvalde safe. The positive impact of this volunteer fire department resonates across Texas' 23rd Congressional District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 11, 2018, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote 14. Had I been present for rollcall vote 14, I would have voted "YEA".

THANKING CHRISTIAN MORGAN FOR HIS SERVICE TO MISSOURI'S 2ND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, today I include in the RECORD a tribute that means a great deal to me, my family, and my staff. Tomorrow we bid farewell to my Chief of Staff of five years, Christian Morgan.

Every day, Christian has exemplified the conservative principles for which my office fights. His love for his family, faith in Jesus Christ, and undying belief in what our country stands for have led my office from the day I was sworn in, and his presence will be felt

long after his departure. Christian led by example; he was always the last to leave the office and the first to arrive. He guided, motivated, and empowered my staff and myself through fiscal cliffs, our historic fight against human trafficking, and countless pieces of legislation that improved our community in St. Louis.

I owe Christian a great debt of gratitude that I will never be able to fully repay, and today we bid him, the man who steered the ship, a fond farewell. It is a sendoff to a person who always kept a level head, was slow to anger, and quick to listen and lead with a spirit of humility. Christian truly embodies our guiding mission to serve a cause greater than oneself and be a voice for the most vulnerable. We wish him the very best moving forward, and we are grateful for Christian Morgan's service and sacrifice to our office, the Second District of Missouri, and our Great Nation.

May he always remember these words in Romans 5: 4–5, ''Endurance produces character, and character produces hope, and hope does not put us to shame, because God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us.''

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S143–S170

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2293–2305, and S. Res. 372–373. **Pages S167–68**

Measures Passed:

Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act: Committee on Indian Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 984, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, and the bill was then passed. **Page S153**

Congratulating the North Dakota State University football team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 372, congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2017 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title. **Page S170**

Medal of Honor: Senate passed H.R. 4641, to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps. **Page S170**

House Messages:

FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the amendment of the House to S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S153–65**

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill. **Pages S153–54**

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1870 (to the House Amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date. **Page S154**

McConnell Amendment No. 1871 (to Amendment No. 1870), of a perfecting nature. **Page S154**

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1872, to change the enactment date. **Page S154**

McConnell Amendment No. 1873 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 1872), of a perfecting nature. **Page S154**

McConnell Amendment No. 1874 (to Amendment No. 1873), of a perfecting nature. **Page S154**

A motion was entered to close further debate on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, January 16, 2018. **Page S154**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 68 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. 10), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the House message to accompany the bill. **Pages S153–54**

Prior to the consideration of this measure today, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S153**

A unanimous consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 4:30 p.m., on Tuesday, January 16, 2018, Senate resume consideration of the amendment of the House to the bill; and that the filing deadlines under Rule XXII, with respect to the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, be at the following times on Tuesday, January 16, 2018: 4:45 p.m. for all first-degree amendments, and 5:15 p.m. for all second-degree amendments. **Page S170**

Appointments:

United States Semiquincentennial Commission: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law

114–196, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission: Rosa G. Rios of Maryland. **Page S170**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By a unanimous vote of 92 yeas (Vote No. EX. 7), Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia. **Page S150**

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. EX. 9), Walter David Counts III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas. **Page S153**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 90 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 8), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S150**

Messages from the House: **Page S167**

Measures Referred: **Page S167**

Executive Communications: **Page S167**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S167**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S168–69**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S167–68**

Additional Statements: **Pages S166–67**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S169–70**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S170**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S170**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—10) **Pages S150, S153–54**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:29 p.m., until 1 p.m. on Friday, January 12, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S170.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

U.S. POLICY IN SYRIA POST-ISIS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States policy in Syria post-ISIS, after receiving testimony from David M. Satterfield, Senior Bureau Official for Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2152, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for assistance for victims of child pornography, with an amendment; and

The nominations of Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, and Joseph D. Brown, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas, Matthew D. Krueger, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Norman Euell Arflack, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and Ted G. Kamatchus, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Iowa, all of the Department of Justice.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 4766–4784; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 98; and H. Res. 684–691 were introduced. **Pages H168–69**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H170**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4043, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to reauthorize the whistleblower protection program, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–510);

H.R. 1701, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–511, Part 1);

H.R. 3737, to provide for a study on the use of social media in security clearance investigations (H. Rept. 115–512); and

H.R. 1532, to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Poarch Band

of Creek Indians, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–513). Page H168

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Simpson to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H135

Rapid DNA Act: The House passed S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, and to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, by a yea-and-nay vote of 256 yeas to 164 nays, Roll No. 16. Pages H137–60

Rejected the Himes motion to commit the bill to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 15. Pages H158–59

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–53 shall be considered as adopted. Page H137

Rejected:

Amash amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–504) that sought to replace the text of S. 139 with the text of the USA RIGHTS Act (by a yea-and-nay vote of 183 yeas to 233 nays, Roll No. 14). Pages H149–58

H. Res. 682, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (S. 139) was agreed to yesterday, January 10th.

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, January 9th.

Counter Terrorist Network Act: H.R. 4578, to authorize certain counter terrorist networks activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 410 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 17. Page H160

Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass H.R. 4708, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign. Page H161

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, January 12th and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourns to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, January 16th for Morning Hour debate. Page H162

Directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 78, directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139. Page H162

Committee Chairwoman Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Black wherein she resigned as the Chairwoman of the Committee on the Budget. Page H162

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Gowdy wherein he resigned from the Committee on Ethics. Pages H162–63

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 685, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. Page H163

Senate Referral: S. 875 was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Page H166

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H160.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H157–58, H159, H159–160, and H160. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 12:31 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

1 p.m., Friday, January 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Friday, January 12

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 10 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.