United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2017 No. 24

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, February 13, 2017, at 12 p.m.

Senate

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, who inhabits eternity, thank You for also dwelling in contrite hearts.

Today, meet the needs of our lawmakers from Your celestial bounty. Strengthen their hearts in Your ways against temptation and make them more than conquerors in Your love. In all that they say and do, may they seek Your glory, striving for faithfulness in even the small matters of their labors. With Your saving kindness, keep them from stumbling or slipping, preparing them to stand before Your glory without fault or blemish.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 10, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. CAPITO thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Steven T. Mnuchin, of California, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, the Senate is now debating the nomination of Steven Mnuchin to be the Secretary of the Treasury, and this is yet another nomination on which the majority has walked away, unfortunately, from a 20-year bipartisan approach when it comes to the vetting process.

In 2009, when Tim Geithner was President Obama's first Treasury nominee, a vetting issue came up and both sides of the Finance Committee carried the investigation out to its conclusion, but the situation has turned out quite differently this time.

There were several properties in the United States and abroad worth $100 million missing from Mr. Mnuchin's disclosure. He failed to disclose several positions in various firms. He misled the public. He misled the committee about his bank foreclosure tactics, and he appears to have hidden key data requested by Members of this body. Frankly, I don't believe these investigations would have been uncovered at all if not for the work of the minority's investigation team. The majority, however, looked the other way, and the vetting process was ended prematurely. So the vote on this nomination is imminent. That is the first concern held by Members on this side, and I am going to speak more about that today and as this debate continues.

This morning, though, I want to focus on the substance of our concerns.

The single biggest challenge is what to do to reconnect working Americans with this country's economic engine. There are communities across the land, including many in my home State of Oregon where folks are just waiting for economic recovery to show up. They see their homes foreclosed, storefronts boarded up, factories shuttered. They

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

just feel stuck. Aside from the President himself, nobody in America has greater influence over this Nation's economic future than the U.S. Treasury Secretary. That is the case whether it is through tax reform that fights unfairness, rules that rein in Wall Street abuses, or smart infrastructure and trade policies that create good-paying jobs here at home. We call them red, white, and blue jobs.

The person who becomes Treasury Secretary has to be somebody who is ready to work on behalf of all Americans, including those Americans from the corners of our Nation where optimism has dimmed. If Steven Mnuchin's record is any indication, he simply doesn't fit that mold, not even close.

There is a lot to debate as the Senate considers Mr. Mnuchin's nomination. Particularly significant, in my judgment as the ranking member on the Senate Finance Committee, is the issue of how our Tax Code punishes wage-earning Americans. I am going to cover that this morning. In my view, though, the debate begins with the story of OneWest, Mr. Mnuchin's bank. It begins with a lot of gory details of how OneWest industrialized the process of kicking people out of their homes and onto the streets, and it begins with the details of how Mr. Mnuchin enriched himself at the same time his foreclosure machine was running.

As I described, the financial crisis was a personal setback from which a lot of Americans still have not recovered, but for Mr. Mnuchin, it wasn't exactly a setback at all. In fact, it was the deal of a lifetime. In March, 2009, Mr. Mnuchin led a group of investors who bought IndyMac Bank, one of several banks that had been engulfed in crisis the year before.

Mr. Mnuchin and his group got an unusually sweet deal from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, buying $23.5 billion worth of assets for less than $1.6 billion. IndyMac was renamed OneWest Bank and it opened up shop the very next day.

As part of this sweetheart deal, Mr. Mnuchin got what is known as a Shared-Loss Agreement from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Under the deal with OneWest, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation made nearly $900 billion in payments to OneWest for IndyMac loans. Total payments from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to OneWest, including payments for loans made to OneWest subsidiaries First Federal, La Jolla, and Financial Freedom, were $1.22 billion.

It didn't take long after Mr. Mnuchin rolled out the newly branded OneWest for the bank to be investigated by State attorneys general around the country. Already they had big concerns about OneWest's foreclosure practices, and this, in my view, is where you see the guts of the foreclosure machine beginning to show itself.

As part of this investigation, a OneWest vice president who worked under Mr. Mnuchin, Erica Johnson-Seck, admitted under oath to the practice known as robo-signing. This witness said she signed more than 750 foreclosure documents a week without reading them and with no notary present during the process. That is a violation of the law. When asked how much time she spent executing each foreclosure document, Ms. JOHNSON-Seck replied: ''I changed my signature considerably. It's just an E now. So not more than 30 seconds.''

It was not just Ms. Johnson-Seck. She was part of an entire team operating at this pace. In her deposition, Ms. Johnson-Seck stated there were about 1,100 documents signed by her office each day, or roughly 6,000 a week.

So amid an economic meltdown—our Nation shedding hundreds of thousands of jobs, families facing an uncertain future—Mr. Mnuchin found a way to profit. He bought a bank from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation at an extreme discount. He struck a deal with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation so he could be reimbursed for 80 percent or more of the bank's losses. He had at least one team in place that could sign 6,000 foreclosure documents a week—6,000 individuals and families a week thrown into this nightmare of potentially losing their homes. Mr. Mnuchin and OneWest were churning out foreclosures with ruthless efficiency. That doesn't sound to me like somebody who is going to be the kind of person who is going to look out for the interests of working families.

I want to talk a little bit about some who were victimized by OneWest's industrialized foreclosure. One of those was Dee Roberson, who in 2010 shared her story with the Orlando Sentinel. Ms. Roberson told them her parents were struggling to pay off the balance of their mortgage with OneWest. The mortgage had a balance of just $3,000, and Ms. Roberson was trying to help her parents get to the finish line, but instead of the usual mortgage payment of $600, OneWest demanded over $1,000 a month. OneWest said the home was in foreclosure and wanted $4,000 in attorneys' fees, but the Robersons had never received a foreclosure notice. When Ms. Roberson called OneWest to sort things out, it was just one big runaround.

Gerald Lembach is an Army retiree who needed cash to finish an addition on his modest ranch-style home in Pasadena, MD. He and his wife had owned their home for 23 years. According to a story in the Baltimore Sun, Mr. Lembach discovered the monthly cost for the new loan was much higher than what he expected. Instead of the $3,200 monthly bill he anticipated, it was almost $4,300. OneWest, which took over the servicing of Mr. Lembach's loan in 2009, denied his request for a modification in October 2010, a month after it had started foreclosure proceedings. He struggled with the process, and he hired an attorney who noticed something that struck him as very odd. Signatures on the foreclosure documents were fakes. In fact, various foreclosure processors around the State of Maryland had been signing under the same lawyer's name, but even with this discovery of false signatures, it didn't bring about the speedy modification that Mr. Lembach was hoping for.

Rose Gudiel and her family bought a small house in 2005, making payments on the mortgage until her brother was murdered in 2009 and the family lost his income. The next mortgage payment was 2 weeks late. OneWest said it wouldn't accept it, and Ms. Gudiel had to apply for a loan modification instead, but OneWest didn't actually own the mortgage, they were only servicing it. They didn't even have the authority to grant a modification. So this citizen was caught in limbo for 2 years, unable to modify the loan and at the same time had to fight eviction.

Out of options, Ms. Gudiel and a group of protestors went to Mr. Mnuchin's home, protesting outside and demanding answers. Shortly thereafter, despite OneWest's claim that there was nothing they could do to help Ms. Gudiel, they relented. She was allowed to keep her home, but it took essentially a four-alarm public relations calamity to make that happen.

Mark and Jenny Gin are another case Mr. Mnuchin may have heard about. The Gins sued OneWest in San Mateo Superior Court, and they won.

I will just describe a little bit from the San Francisco Chronicle how their case played out. While the Gins were making dozens of calls and submitting reams of paperwork to get a loan modification from OneWest, another department of the bank proceeded to foreclose on their home. This is especially important because this is a phenomenon known as dual tracking.

OneWest strung the Gins along for months before telling them just to send in their loan modification application. They said the Gins would have an answer in 30 to 60 days. But instead of a modification, they got an eviction notice. They were forced out of their home while Ms. Gin was 8 months pregnant and grappling with a breast cancer diagnosis.

They were left with no choice but to take OneWest to court. Their legal battle stretched more than 2 years. The costs were so substantial that even a victory in court could not save their home.

Those are all examples of typical mortgages—everyday homeowners caught up in OneWest's exceptional and ruthless foreclosure practices.

But it wasn't just your typical mortgage that OneWest foreclosed upon; the bank had a big reverse mortgage operation called Financial Freedom, and the foreclosure machine was running and running and running over there too.

The goal of a reverse mortgage is to give older people—62 or older—the opportunity to use the equity in their homes to help cover the bills. Unfortunately, it doesn't always go smoothly.

In OneWest's reverse mortgage division, it often went terribly wrong.

A lot of older couples of modest incomes who got reverse mortgages put them under only one name, often the husband's. But here is the catch: If the person whose name appeared on the documents passed away, the terms of the reverse mortgage required the loan to be paid back in full. If it wasn't, then the foreclosure process once again kicks in.

So you have a family where first they lose their loved one, then they lose their home, and they are caught up in this nightmare scenario of a reverse mortgage. A common name for this practice—it almost hurts to say it—is ''widow foreclosure.'' Widow foreclosure.

According to documents reviewed by the California Reinvestment Coalition, during the first 6 years Mr. Mnuchin ran OneWest, the bank accounted for nearly 40 percent of all federally insured reverse mortgage foreclosures. They led the Nation in widow foreclosures.

You know, if you think about what you can lead the Nation in and you are thinking about trying to help hard-hit families, the kinds of families I just described, I would like to lead the Nation in terms of reaching out and finding imaginative ways to help them, to really go to bat for them, take them through the process, create something that is fair and commonsense.

What does this bank do? They lead the Nation in widow foreclosures.

In one case, OneWest and its predecessor tried to foreclose on an elderly Florida woman. That was twice. The first time, Mr. Mnuchin's bank tried to foreclose on her home and filed paperwork saying she didn't live there. When they finally discovered she, in fact, did live in the home, they backed off. Two years later, OneWest's new parent company, CIT, where Mr. Mnuchin was a board member, tried to foreclose again. This time it was over an unpaid bill of 27 cents.

This involved a woman who was 90. A woman who was 90 was involved in a foreclosure with an unpaid bill of 27 cents. She had to fight to keep her home twice because she was bombarded with petty and inaccurate allegations from Mr. Mnuchin's bank.

The President recently tweeted out an allegation that this story was ''fake news'' because the elderly woman never actually lost her home. The ordeal that OneWest's foreclosure machine put her through certainly was not fake news to her and others who were up against this activity.

While OneWest was putting thousands of homeowners through the nightmare of foreclosure, Mr. Mnuchin used the bank's money to make some pretty flashy investments in Hollywood. In September 2012, OneWest led a group of financial institutions that established a revolving credit facility for Relativity Media of hundreds of millions of dollars. Relativity was a movie studio led by a flamboyant executive named Ryan Kavanaugh.

Press accounts also claim that Mr. Mnuchin and Mr. Kavanaugh became good friends. In fact, even though Mr. Kavanaugh was a client who owed his bank hundreds of millions of dollars, he and Mr. Mnuchin bought a private jet together and then traveled to various kinds of film festivals around the world. They were even investing in real estate together. They put millions into a shell company, HMBAC LLC, which owned property in Southern California.

In October of 2014, Mr. Mnuchin decided to buy into Mr. Kavanaugh's movie studio himself. He purchased a stake. He was appointed cochairman of Relativity.

So while he was pulling double duty on the boards of OneWest and Relativity, OneWest had to report the size of the insider loans the bank was making to Relativity. As a share of bank capital, OneWest's insider loans exceeded 94 of the country's 100 biggest financial institutions.

Unfortunately, Mr. Mnuchin's time with Relativity didn't go so hot. Each year from 2012 to 2014, the studio suffered eight- or nine-figure losses. Finally, in 2015, Relativity's problems came to a head, but it owed OneWest and Mr. Mnuchin a huge sum of money.

On May 29, 2015, Mr. Mnuchin quit the board. A few days later, funds totaling $50 million in cash were swept back to OneWest from several Relativity operating accounts. One of those accounts was earmarked to pay guild expenses—salaries for everyday contractors and production tradespeople. That put the nail in Relativity's coffin, and the studio declared bankruptcy.

Mr. Mnuchin's adventure of putting OneWest money into Relativity might have been a big mess, but it sure didn't do much damage to the bank's bottom line.

Around the time Relativity crumbled, OneWest was purchased by an even bigger group, the CIT Group, at a massive profit. Mr. Mnuchin and his investors originally bought the bank in 2009 for less than $1.6 billion. In 2015, CIT Group bought it from Mr. Mnuchin and his partners for $3.4 billion.

In between, while tens of thousands of Americans were going through this daily nightmare of losing their homes, the bank had paid out more than $1 billion in dividends to Mr. Mnuchin and its other owners.

Buying OneWest was literally the deal of a lifetime for Mr. Mnuchin, but the bank's conduct caught the attention of Federal watchdogs more than once. In 2011, the Office of Thrift Supervision conducted an examination of OneWest's foreclosure process, and I am just going to outline a few of the findings. These are the findings of the Office of Thrift Supervision, which is in the business of monitoring and examining these institutions.

They found, for example, that OneWest employees filed affidavits in State and Federal courts, falsely stating that they had conducted a review and had personal knowledge regarding the details of a disputed mortgage, including principal and interest due or other fees and expenses when no such reviews had taken place.

OneWest employees filed documents in State and Federal courts that had not been signed or affirmed in the presence of a notary.

OneWest litigated foreclosure and bankruptcy proceedings without ensuring that the promissory notes were properly endorsed or assigned and in possession of the appropriate party at the appropriate time.

OneWest failed to devote sufficient resources to the administration of its foreclosure and loan modifications procedures.

OneWest management failed to enact adequate internal oversight and controls to its foreclosure processes.

Finally, OneWest failed to adequately oversee the outside lawyers handling foreclosure-related services.

The Office of Thrift Supervision also demanded that OneWest take corrective action, and it issued what is known as a consent order. Basically in English, this OneWest consent order was an agreement to clean up its act. The order was signed personally by Mr. Mnuchin and the OneWest board of directors. They had been running OneWest for 2 years at this point, and the company was rife with problems.

In 2014, another watchdog stepped in. This time, it was the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. Their audit found that more than 10,000 OneWest borrowers were due $8.5 million for improper foreclosure practices. According to the same report, OneWest paid nearly $3 million to 54 borrowers for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, which protects members of our armed services from losing their homes while they are serving our country.

So just think about that one. Here is the bank having to pay borrowers $3 million for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act. This is what protects the courageous people who serve our country. It is a law that protects these people from losing their homes while they put themselves at great risk, may make the ultimate sacrifice, and every day, their families at home are worrying about them and often worrying about their finances.

According to this report, OneWest paid nearly $3 million to 54 borrowers who violated this law that protects the courageous men and women who wear the uniform of the United States.

At the heart of these investigations was the issue of robo-signing, the practice I have spoken about earlier in the context of the OneWest team churning out 6,000 foreclosure documents a week. Senator CASEY and Senator BROWN on our committee really zeroed in on this issue. And it was particularly concerning in this context to Senator CASEY, who represents a lot of people who lost their homes to foreclosures by Mr. Mnuchin's bank.

So Senator CASEY put the question to Mr. Mnuchin in writing after Mr. Mnuchin had his Finance Committee hearing. Senator CASEY asked pretty simply: Did OneWest robo-sign documents?

This was a straightforward question, and based on the public record, the answer should have been a straightforward ''yes.'' Instead, Mr. Mnuchin replied, ''OneWest Bank did not robo-sign documents.''

Years of documented proof say that is false. So the committee gave Mr. Mnuchin an opportunity to amend his response. Once again, Mr. Mnuchin denied—denied—the truth. First he said, ''The concept of 'robo-signing' generally referred to two distinct but related issues: (a) a signer of a foreclosure affidavit attested to facts that were not verified to be accurate; or (b) a signer of a foreclosure affidavit represented himself or herself to be someone else.''

So that is a fancy way to explain. When we gave him an opportunity to amend his answer, Mr. Mnuchin again denied the truth on this question of OneWest robo-signing documents.

And he went on to say, ''OneWest did not do these things.''

There is just no way of getting around it—none. That statement is flat wrong.

The language Mr. Mnuchin used to redefine robo-signing is nearly identical to the language used by the Office of Thrift Supervision in the findings of its investigation. Given the watchdogs report, testimony from OneWest employees, and the public record, Mr. Mnuchin cannot possibly, in good faith, claim that OneWest did not robo-sign. In fact, Mr. Mnuchin's signature is on one of the documents that proves otherwise, the Office of Thrift Supervision consent order. He ran the bank. Surely, he had to read the document before signing it. So Mr. Mnuchin misled the Finance Committee and the American people on robo-signing, directly contradicting a mountain of evidence.

Senators CASEY and BROWN represent States where a lot of families were hammered through foreclosures pursued by Mr. Mnuchin's bank. Senator CASEY and Senator BROWN decided to do some more digging into the information. Senator CASEY sought OneWest national foreclosure figures. Senator BROWN asked for a State-by-State breakdown. This information was never provided.

At first Mr. Mnuchin said he just couldn't get the data. Then Senator HELLER made a similar request. It seems Mr. Mnuchin answered sufficiently to satisfy Senator HELLER, whose State had a large number of OneWest foreclosures. So in my mind, that raises a question about why a Republican Senator could get his inquiry answered but a pair of Democrats could not.

Getting other basic facts from Mr. Mnuchin was pretty much like a painful time at the dentist, pulling teeth. Here is an example. The Finance Committee requested nominees ''list all positions held as an officer, director, trustee, partner, proprietor, agent, representative, or consultant of any corporation, company, firm, partnership, other business enterprise, or educational or other institution.''

When Mr. Mnuchin filed his paperwork with the committee, he signed them, attesting that the document was true, accurate, and complete. However, it became apparent to committee staff that key information was missing. In particular, SEC filings indicated that Mr. Mnuchin was director of Dune Capital International, an entity located in the Cayman Islands. It was nowhere to be found in Mr. Mnuchin's paperwork. He also failed to disclose his role as chairman and CEO of the OneWest Foundation, an entity that is alleged to have made generous donations to groups that publicly endorsed OneWest's controversial purchase by CIT Group. He even failed to report that he had been chairman of IMB HoldCo, the holding company that he used to purchase IndyMac, the bank that he turned into OneWest. All told, after questions were raised by the Finance Committee's staff, Mr. Mnuchin disclosed that he held positions in an additional 14 entities that were not listed on his initial paperwork.

Here is an example of Mr. Mnuchin's failure to fully disclose his various investments. The Finance Committee requests that all nominees list ''the identity and value of all assets held, directly or indirectly, with a value in excess of $1,000.'' That is pretty straightforward. ''The identity and value of all assets held, directly or indirectly, with a value in excess of $1,000'' was to be disclosed. Mr. Mnuchin failed to do this as well. On his initial paperwork, committee staff noted that Mr. Mnuchin listed membership in a vacation resort in Mexico, but he didn't disclose any related property. That was only the first case of missing Mnuchin real estate. After questioning by committee staff, Mr. Mnuchin disclosed still more missing Mnuchin real estate—an additional $95 million in real estate holdings that had not been listed on his initial paperwork. The fact is, the committee had to take the time and ask the questions to track down these multimillion dollar properties, Mr. Mnuchin's unreported businesses, and his undisclosed business relationships.

Again, I am convinced that none of what I have described, these undisclosed assets—these substantial and undisclosed assets—would ever have been brought to light if it wasn't for the work of the committee's minority staff investigators. Yet despite these efforts, Mr. Mnuchin still has never produced the information requested by two members of the Finance Committee, Senators CASEY and BROWN, concerning the OneWest foreclosures.

My view is that this is another nominee who has the ethics alarm bell sounding. He has already misled the public. He appears to be concealing information requested by Members of this body, and his claim to fame is the cold and staggering efficiency with which his bank booted predatory lending victims out of their home. I just don't think this is the type of person who should lead the Treasury Department.

Because we will have further discussion on this, I simply close speaking about the kind of person I want to see head the Treasury Department. I note that I have supported a number of Republicans for this particular position in my time on the Finance Committee. I want the kind of person who is going to give everybody in America the opportunity to get ahead. We are going to have more discussion about taxes and particularly important in this role will be the Treasury Secretary's view of taxes.

We have a Tax Code that is really a tale of two systems. If you are a cop or a nurse in West Virginia or in Oregon, your taxes are compulsory. Once or twice a month your taxes are just lifted out of your paycheck because you are a working person. That is the way it works in West Virginia. That is the way it works in Oregon.

But if you have a battery of financial experts, it doesn't work that way. You can use that battery of financial experts to pay what you want, when you want to, and, maybe, not much at all. For this position I want somebody who feels passionately about giving everybody in America the opportunity to get ahead, who really understands what a priority it is to work to bring economic recovery to those communities dimmed by hardship and suffering folks. I know there are a number of people like that in the State of the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate, and there sure are a lot of them in my home State of Oregon. A lot of those rural communities just feel like they have been hit by a wrecking ball. That is the kind of Treasury Secretary I want—a Treasury Secretary who gives everybody in America the opportunity to get ahead.

Thus far, I just don't see Mr. Mnuchin fitting that mold. We will go on to talk about other issues next week, particularly, his view with respect to taxes. We will have further discussion on it next week.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ALEXANNA SALMON

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, these past few weeks, I have had the opportunity to come to the floor to recognize truly exceptional Alaskans—those who dedicate their time, energy, and talent to strengthening our communities and making Alaska a truly extraordinary place to call home.

My colleagues here, those in the Gallery, those watching on TV, might know Alaska for its natural wonders. We certainly have those in spades. We want you all to come visit. It will be a life-changing experience, I promise.

For those of us who live there, community is everything. Living in one of the most magnificent places on Earth also has challenges. We depend on each other, our traditional knowledge, our ingenuity, our determination to overcome those challenges, particularly as a community.

Today I would like to transport you to the village of Igiugig in Southwest Alaska, and introduce you to an amazing young woman who is truly making a difference in her community. AlexAnna Salmon is our Alaskan of the Week.

First, a little bit about where she lives. Rich in Alaskan Native traditions, her village is home to around 70 residents year-round, growing to more than 200 in the summer months. The name Igiugig comes from a Yupik word meaning ''like a throat that swallows water.'' It is referring to the location of the village which sits where the Kvichak River meets Lake Iliamna.

Western Alaska has been home to thriving, sustainable communities for a millennia, but rising energy costs and overregulations have put the future of these communities at risk. In fact, many of these communities, particularly in rural Alaska, face some of the highest energy costs in the country, which is a bit of a cruel irony given how resource-rich Alaska is, but in typical Alaska fashion, this village, facing these energy challenges, comes together as a community to embrace new technologies and new ways to address these challenges.

At the forefront of this rural revolution and sustainable community is our Alaskan of the Week, AlexAnna Salmon. Raised in Igiugig, AlexAnna has emerged as a leader in her community, now serving as the village council president.

She has had that position since just after graduating cum laude from Dartmouth College in 2008, with a double major in Native American studies and anthropology.

While at Dartmouth, she won a prestigious writing award for her senior thesis on life in her village. When she was done with college, she, along with her sister, came back to her community, to her village, to raise her family. In her words, she stated, ''I felt that I had the greatest childhood here in Igiugig. This is where kids need to be raised.'' She wants their childhood experiences to be as great or even better and meaningful as hers.

To keep her community thriving, particularly with these energy challenges—and to make it even a better place for the next generation—she encourages healthy lifestyles, helps improve local infrastructure, and works tirelessly toward ensuring that people in her village have a sustainable source of food and energy.

AlexAnna has overseen the establishment of community farms and gardens, wind turbines, solar collectors, centralized recycling, building upgrades, weatherization, and most recently helped launch a very exciting hydro project.

For her dedication to the well-being of her community and to all Alaskans and for tackling unique challenges with both creativity and determination, for making the impossible, in some of the most extreme parts of our country in terms of rural living, seem possible, AlexAnna Salmon is the Alaskan of the Week.

Congratulations, AlexAnna, and thank you. Your dedication epitomizes what it means to be an Alaskan, honoring the traditions of our past and seizing the opportunities here and now to provide for a bright future.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, out on the campaign trail, Donald Trump talked a big game about Wall Street. He said: ''Wall Street has caused tremendous problems for us.'' He claimed that he was not going to let Wall Street get away with murder.

His closing ad expressed outrage at Wall Street ''controlling the levers of power in Washington.'' It pictured Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein as part of ''the global special interests that were rigging the economy against working families.''

Then Trump won, and within days he hired and nominated enough Goldman Sachs alumni to open a new bank branch in the White House. His senior strategist, Steve Bannon, spent half a decade at Goldman Sachs as an investment banker. His National Economic Council Director, Gary Cohn, came directly from Goldman Sachs, where he spent 25 years and rose to be second in command at the bank. His Senior Counsel for Economic Initiatives, Dina Powell, came directly from Goldman Sachs, where she has been a partner since 2010.

Finally, Donald Trump nominated Steve Mnuchin to serve as his Secretary of Treasury. Mr. Mnuchin spent 17 years at Goldman Sachs, much of it in the distribution that created and peddled the kinds of mortgage-backed securities that would later blow up the financial system.

Personnel is policy. The selection of all of these Goldman Sachs executives to serve as core members of Trump's economic team shows that the President has no interest in reducing Wall Street's influence in Washington and leveling the playing field for working families. Instead, it will be the same Republican playbook—gutting the rules for big banks, firing the cops on Wall Street—the same playbook that paved the way for the 2008 financial crisis.

But even among the group of Goldman Sachs bankers surrounding the President, the selection of Mr. Mnuchin as Treasury Secretary stands out. The Treasury Secretary leads the Council responsible for making sure Wall Street doesn't blow up our economy again.

The Council cannot do anything without the support of the Treasury Secretary. No other official has greater responsibility to stand up to Wall Street if they threaten the economy again. Yet there is nothing—nothing—in Mr. Mnuchin's record to suggest that he could stand up to Wall Street. In fact, there is nothing in Mr. Mnuchin's record to suggest that he would even want to stand up to Wall Street, that he has even thought of standing up to Wall Street.

Mr. Mnuchin is the ultimate Wall Street insider. From the moment he graduated from college until today, he has worked at a big bank or a hedge fund. If Wall Street threatens to blow up the economy again, does anyone seriously expect Mr. Mnuchin to get tough with his old buddies and tell them to knock it off?

In fact, you can expect just the opposite. Mr. Mnuchin pretty much laps the field when it comes to personal experience in tilting the playing field in favor of financial interests and against working families. In late 2008, as the financial crisis was sweeping across the country, Mr. Mnuchin lead a team of millionaires to purchase IndyMac Bank out of Federal receivership. He rebranded the bank as OneWest and put himself in charge as CEO. Then, Mr. Mnuchin and OneWest acted swiftly and decisively to boot more than 60,000 families out of their homes across the country.

Look, I get it. Foreclosures happen in an economic crisis. But OneWest, Mr. Mnuchin's bank, was different. It quickly gained a reputation as a foreclosure machine, both because it was so aggressive at foreclosing on families and because the bank hardly did anything else.

Countless homeowners who were trapped by a OneWest mortgage had their lives turned upside down. Some ended up homeless.

How sleazy and out of line was Mr. Mnuchin's bank? Well, the bank paid millions of dollars to settle lawsuits for predatory foreclosure practices. They were so sleazy that they even got hit with almost $3 million in fines for violating the rights of dozens of Active-Duty servicemembers.

You really have to ask: What kind of a man does something like that—cheats our soldiers while they are on Active Duty? The model Mr. Mnuchin developed for OneWest was terrible for homeowners, but it was fabulous for him. Six years after buying the bank, he sold it and reportedly pocketed as much as $200 million in personal profit—$200 million for 6 years of throwing families out of their homes—wow, only on Wall Street.

Mr. Mnuchin's leadership of OneWest is critical to evaluating his fitness to serve as Treasury Secretary. That is why I joined 24 other Democratic Senators in asking Chairman HATCH of the Senate Finance Committee to include some of Mr. Mnuchin's foreclosure victims as witnesses at Mr. Mnuchin's hearing.

The chairman refused. So Democrats invited some of those homeowners to come to the Senate anyway to share their stories at a forum. We invited every Senator—Democrat or Republican—to attend the forum. We also invited Mr. Mnuchin to attend. Not one single Republican showed up—not one. Mr. Mnuchin refused to attend. But Senate Democrats turned out to listen. The stories that we heard will break your heart.

We heard from Colleen Ison-Hodroff, from Minneapolis, MN. Colleen is 84 years old. She and her husband Monroe got a reverse mortgage on their fully paid-off home from Financial Freedom, which is a OneWest subsidiary. At the time, the broker assured them that Colleen could keep living in her home even if her husband passed away before she did. But just days—just days—after Monroe's funeral, Mr. Mnuchin's bank told her she needed to pay off the entire loan or face foreclosure. She has been fighting them off for 2 years now, but the threat hangs over her and her family.

Sylvia Oliver from Scotch Plains, NJ, also told us her story. She had been trying for years to get a loan modification from OneWest. For years, the bank refused to work with her in good faith. Sylvia choked up as she described how she felt when her young daughter told her: Mom, I love our home. She had to smile and look her daughter in the eye, not knowing whether they could keep that home for more than even a few more weeks.

We heard from Cristina Clifford, from Carlsbad, CA. Cristina is a real go-getter, a self-employed small business owner who saved up enough money to buy her first home soon after she turned 20. When the financial crisis hit, the income from her business dried up, and she reached out to Mr. Mnuchin's bank for a modification. But when she sent in her modification paperwork, along with the check for her first new payment, she sent them in a single envelope, and Mr. Mnuchin's bank claimed they had never received the paperwork even though they cashed the check that was in the same envelope.

Ultimately, Mr. Mnuchin's bank foreclosed on Cristina, just days after an employee personally had assured her that she could still work out a modification to keep her home. But she lost her home.

We also heard from Heather McCreary, a mother of twin boys from Sparks, NV. Like a lot of families, Heather and her husband Jack were hit hard in the financial crisis. She lost her job as a home health aide, and Jack, who worked construction, got fewer hours and lower wages. Heather and Jack applied to OneWest for a modification. They did everything they were told. But it did not matter to Mr. Mnuchin and his friends at OneWest.

The bank strung them along for years and then, in the blink of an eye, foreclosed so abruptly that it literally put Heather, her husband Jack, and their twin boys out on the street.

All four of these women begged the Senate to reject Mr. Mnuchin's nomination. Heather said:

> Putting Steve Mnuchin in charge of the country's financial system is an insult to families like mine, families who worked hard and did everything they could to get by after the economy collapsed. Take it from my experience, I know he will not be looking out for working people. Instead, he will use his position to make the economy work better for people like himself.

No track record of independence from Wall Street, a history of profiting off the financial crisis by squeezing working families to the breaking point—each one of those should be disqualifying to serve as Treasury Secretary. That should be the end of his nomination. We should be done with this. But there is more.

During Mr. Mnuchin's nomination process, he flat-out lied to the Senate. Senator CASEY from Pennsylvania asked Mr. Mnuchin a straightforward factual question about foreclosure abuses at OneWest. Mr. Mnuchin claimed they did not happen. That is not even a good lie. Within days, reporters found court documents contradicting Mr. Mnuchin's claim. You know, something like that should not be a partisan issue. A person who lies to Congress should not be the country's top economic official—period, done.

But when Senate Democrats demanded that Mr. Mnuchin come before the Finance Committee again to account for his statement, Republicans on the committee unilaterally changed the rules and rammed Mr. Mnuchin's nomination through without a single Democrat present.

Do Senate Republicans care about Mr. Mnuchin's lies?

The American people should.

If Mr. Mnuchin is willing to lie about something that is so easily disproved by public court documents, what else is he willing to lie about? How can Congress or the American people believe him ever again?

We know Mr. Mnuchin has the full support of Wall Street. The big bank lobbyists, Mr. Mnuchin's hedge fund pals, man, they want to see him confirmed. They are lobbying hard. They know he will help out his old buddies and give them all the financial rule rollbacks and sweetheart deals that they want. What we know is that is usually enough to carry the day around here.

But me? I am going with Colleen and Heather and Sylvia and Cristina. I heard what Mr. Mnuchin and his bank did to them and to thousands more like them in Massachusetts and all across the country. The U.S. Senate should not reward that kind of sleazy, cruel, and sometimes illegal conduct by making him the Secretary of Treasury.

We cannot say to the millions of people who lost their homes, who lost their jobs, who lost their savings during the financial crisis, that a man like Mr. Mnuchin will be entrusted with the keys to our Treasury. We cannot say to the American people that someone who lied to Congress—who lied and didn't even have to come back and explain his lie—can become a senior Cabinet official.

A lot of people believed Donald Trump when he said he would be tough on Wall Street. A lot of people voted for him because of that promise. By hiring half of Goldman Sachs to run the economy, Donald Trump has made clear he has no intention of keeping his promise. And now, with the vote on Mr. Mnuchin, the American public will have the chance to see whether Senate Republicans are serious about keeping Wall Street in line too.

Don't hold your breath, America. I will be voting no on Mr. Mnuchin's nomination, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

I want to read some of the stories that we have about Mr. Mnuchin's time at OneWest. You know, you don't have to take this just from me. I may be the one speaking here today, but it is the voices of Colleen and Heather and Sylvia and Cristina and thousands of others whose lives were ruined by Steve Mnuchin's aggressive foreclosure tactics that really deserve to be heard.

I have already told you about Colleen Ison-Hodroff, the 84-year-old woman who is getting cheated out of her home, her home that she lived in for over 50 years and that was fully paid off. She is getting cheated out of that home by Steve Mnuchin's bank.

Now what I would like to do is to share her full story in her own words. This is what she had to say:

> My name is Colleen Ison-Hodroff. I am 84 years old. I am a resident of Minneapolis, Minnesota. My husband Monroe Hodroff and I purchased our home located at 2753 Ewing Avenue in 1963 as a home for our family of six children. They called us the Brady Bunch of Ewing Avenue. Our house was the heart and soul of our family. Monroe and I were married for 55 years, and we successfully ran four small grocery stores. I would like to thank you all very much for allowing me to share my story.
>
> I am here today because Financial Freedom, my reverse mortgage servicer, is trying to foreclose on my home. This is despite the fact that when my husband Monroe and I took out this loan, they told us that I could

remain in the home if Monroe should die before me.

In July of 2006, my husband and I decided to take out a reverse mortgage loan with Financial Freedom. It was a very complicated process. Someone came to our house and I was asked to sign a number of papers. Usually, Monroe handled the financial matters for our household. We were told that I could live in the house if Monroe passed away. It was never Monroe's or my intention that the survivor of the two of us would have to sell the house or leave if one of us died. We would not have signed for the loan if we thought that was the case.

My husband Monroe passed on September 12, 2014. A mere 10 days later, despite what we had been told, Financial Freedom contacted me and told me that I needed to pay off the loan immediately. This was news to me. I was in no financial position to do so. Since then, Financial Freedom has been trying to foreclose on me. I think this is an injustice in that an elderly woman was deceived, and now Financial Freedom is trying to take my home. Why would Financial Freedom do this to me? I relied on what I was told, and now they are trying to kick me out of our family home.

How was I supposed to know if what I was told wasn't true? What am I supposed to do now?

My understanding is that in such circumstances, Financial Freedom blames HUD for it kicking out Non-Borrowing Spouses. Experts who have reviewed my paperwork have told me that this isn't even a HUD-backed loan, so Financial Freedom has no one to blame but themselves. It seems Financial Freedom should be working to keep people like me in their homes, and not fighting to kick us out.

I hear that Steve Mnuchin was a leader of the bank that is doing this to me and other seniors. I do not think a man like that should be the Treasury Secretary and in charge of our economy. We can't let that happen. Thank you again for allowing me to tell my story on behalf of those who have had bad dealings with Financial Freedom and OneWest.

Thank you, Colleen. I appreciate you telling your story.

I also talked about Heather McCreary, her husband, and her twin boys, and how her family was left out on the street because of the greed of Steve Mnuchin and OneWest Bank.

Heather courageously shared her story with us, and here is what she said:

My name is Heather McCreary. My husband Jack, my two kids Jaden and Clara, and I are from Sparks, Nevada. This is my story about how my family's American Dream turned into a nightmare. I'm sharing my story with the hope of explaining why we cannot let Steve Mnuchin become Secretary of the Treasury. Putting Steve Mnuchin in charge of the Treasury Department would mean that a man who profited off the struggles of families like mine would be one of the most powerful people in the U.S. economy.

For a while, it was looking like our shot at the American Dream was going pretty well. In 2006, Jack and I bought our dream home in Sparks—just a mile away from my parents, and a short walk to Jaden and Clara's school and to parks the kids could play in. I was working as a home health care worker and Jack was working in construction, and together we were managing just fine.

Then, in 2008, when the economy started to get worse, I was laid off. The following year in 2009, Jack was laid off too. Though Jack was able to find another job pretty fast, he had to take a big pay cut—from about $25 an hour to $8.50 an hour. Between the cut in Jack's pay and the loss in income I experienced when going on unemployment insurance benefits after I got laid off, we were pinched and we were drowning financially. However, we were determined to keep our dream home, so Jack and I were tenacious about doing whatever we could to get help. We sought help from the Hope Now Alliance, which is an alliance of HUD-approved counselors who provide free foreclosure help, and from the Washoe County Senior Law Project. We worked side-by-side with both organizations to do everything required of us by our mortgage servicer IndyMac, which later became OneWest.

When we first asked for help, OneWest gave us a short forbearance and allowed us to make a smaller payment for several months with the goal of a reduction in our monthly mortgage payments through the Home Affordable Modification Program (or HAMP). By applying for the HAMP program, we thought we were back on the road to keeping our home. We complied 100 percent with OneWest's requirements for HAMP—we were incredibly nervous about being able to keep our house, so we were extremely careful to make sure we did everything we could to keep the process going forward. Our application for HAMP was processed and we were approved for a modification. I sent in the signed paperwork and the first payment under the modified payment amount.

But then the process started to fall apart. After a whole 30 days, OneWest returned our personal check and told us that only certified checks would be accepted, so they were now voiding the modification offer. We had followed the instructions to the letter on OneWest's paperwork, crossing our ''T''s and dotting our ''I''s. But in the end, this didn't matter—and OneWest's rejection of our HAMP application put us on the road to foreclosure.

We applied two more times for loan modifications over the next six months because we were given assurances by people at OneWest that they would approve our application. We again complied with every request OneWest made of us, taking care to send in extra documents whenever OneWest requested them. But as far as I can tell, OneWest never attempted to process the loan modification.

The foreclosure went through and we lost our home on September 10, 2010. The foreclosure left us without a home, and finding a new rental was extremely difficult because of our credit. Juggling the demands of raising our twins and this was so hard—the foreclosure even meant that our kids had to miss school. Eventually we did find a new place, but we had to pay an outrageous rent—even though it was not a good home for us at all. It's hard to explain the shame, embarrassment, and grief that Jack and I felt.

I've cried a river of tears over this. I really didn't think we were asking too much: we wanted to hang onto our home for the sake of our kids, and we did everything we could to stay in our home. And while I will probably never know exactly what OneWest did, the outcome of my story proves that Steve Mnuchin's company had no interest in helping us. They wanted to foreclose because they were focused on their profits. Putting Steve Mnuchin in charge of the country's financial system is an insult to families like mine: families who worked hard and did everything they could to get by after the economy collapsed.

Take it from my experience—I know he will not be looking out for working people. Instead, he will use his position to make the economy work better for people like himself. On behalf of my family and others like it, I ask you to please reject Steve Mnuchin as Treasury Secretary.

Thank you, Heather, for sending in your letter. I appreciate it.

And remember Sylvia? She and her family are facing foreclosure later this month, yet she still came all the way to Washington to stop the Senate from putting Steve Mnuchin in a position to harm millions of others.

Sylvia told us her story, and this is what she said:

My name is Sylvia Oliver, I am a homeowner from Scotch Plains, New Jersey. I got my mortgage from IndyMac in May 2008, and about a month later, IndyMac failed. I want to share my story because it is more than a house—it is a home for me, my husband, and my three children and my grandchildren.

In early 2009, my husband and I were facing financial difficulties. Because of the economy being in bad shape, my husband was between jobs. We reached out to OneWest to request a modification. We were told that we had to make three payments in order to move forward on a permanent modification, and so we made those three payments. After making those payments, I reached back out to OneWest to find out what the next steps were. But I couldn't get a straight answer from them, so we continued making partial payments, even though it was a challenge for us financially.

In February 2010, I submitted a modification application to OneWest Bank. About six weeks later I received a Notice of Intent to Foreclose. However, the person I had been talking to at OneWest, a man named Albert, told me not to worry, and encouraged me to continue submitting updated documents to the bank. So, for the next year, I would submit new documents to the bank, through FedEx and through faxes. And, every week, I would call Albert and ask if he had an update on my situation, and every week I was told there was no answer and to call back the next week.

After a year of my weekly phone calls, I finally a received a denial letter from OneWest in February 2011, when they said they couldn't modify my loan.

Albert at OneWest told me I could reapply for a modification, which I did, because I really wanted to keep our home.

For the next several months, the cycle would repeat with the bank telling me to reapply for a modification, me believing that they were sincere, and then a few months later being told that we had been declined again. This was surprising, because during this time we were back on our feet and our incomes were both increasing, which meant we were in a better position to pay for our mortgage.

At the end of 2015, I received another notice of foreclosure from the bank. At this point it became clear to me that OneWest never had any intention of modifying the loan in such a way that they would still get paid back and we would be able to keep our home.

In March of 2016, I hired a lawyer because I thought they might have more success in working with the bank than I did. At my attorney's advice, I filed a Chapter 13 bankruptcy as part of another modification application. That process went on for about five or six months, with the same cycle of me sending paperwork over and over to the bank, and the same answer again.

Last year I was facing foreclosure three weeks before Christmas. However, that was then postponed until this month. In fact, I was supposed to be foreclosed on by OneWest today—

That is the day she came to Washington—

however, after Senator Menendez's office called OneWest, I learned that my sale had been postponed at least until next month.

Earlier this month, I sought help from a HUD approved housing counselor. She worked with me and my husband to document our income and to submit a modification application. After analyzing the situation, she was surprised to hear that we had not qualified for a modification earlier, especially since my husband and I both had good incomes.

As of right now, I am still facing foreclosure next month—

That would be February—

and I know in my heart this is because OneWest's only intent was to foreclose on my home.

This bank has had ample opportunities to modify my loan. In fact, they told me that they own the loan, so I know they can't blame the situation on an investor not allowing them to modify my loan. Nobody should have to go through the experience that I have gone through during the past several years with OneWest Bank. It has been very painful and stressful not knowing if my kids and my family were going to have a home to live in or if it is going to be foreclosed on.

I would ask you to remember my experience when you consider whether Mr. Mnuchin is qualified to lead the Department of the Treasury. As the CEO and Chair of OneWest Bank, Mr. Mnuchin had the opportunity to help families like mine with responsible loan modification, and he didn't. I don't think this is a track record that anybody should be proud of.

Thank you, Sylvia for telling your story.

Then there is Cristina, a small business owner who owned her own home at the age of 20. I already told you about how Steve Mnuchin's bank ran her in circles until they could foreclose on her house. But now I want you to hear the full story from Cristina. Here is what she said:

Good afternoon. My name is Cristina Clifford. I'm hoping that by sharing my story today I can explain why I believe confirming Steve Mnuchin as Treasury Secretary would be a serious mistake for our country. I experienced firsthand what it was like to be subject to OneWest's greed, and I can tell you that the person who ran OneWest Bank should not be the person responsible for oversight of the U.S. economy.

In 2001, when I was 20, I bought my first home—a great condo in Whittier, California, just outside Los Angeles. I was young, but I've always been a motivated self-starter. I'm also a self-employed, small business owner—my primary source of income. Things were going just fine, and I was never, ever late on my mortgage payments.

However, that changed in 2008—like it did for so many of us—when the economy took a turn for the worse. My business struggled, and I started relying on credit cards to stay afloat. In March of 2009, I was unable to make my mortgage payment for the first time in eight years as a homeowner. I called OneWest directly to see what options I would have for keeping my home. They told me flat out that because I had never been delinquent, they had no way of helping me.

In order to get help, they said, I would have to fall behind on my payments. Of course this was misleading—and, I've since found out, a common tactic that mortgage lenders use to push people into default.

From there, I began the long, long process of loan modification through the Home Affordable Mortgage Program (or HAMP). I sent in numerous documents to OneWest, and in May, I was offered my first loan modification. I was thrilled—the new payments would fit perfectly in my budget, so I signed the loan modification papers and sent them via FedEx along with a check for my first payment under the new, modified payment amount. In July, I expected OneWest to send me a statement with the new lower payment amount. Instead, I received a letter saying that they had not received my loan modification paperwork, so the modification terms were no longer valid. I called them and OneWest confirmed that they had not received my returned loan modification agreement.

I knew right away this wasn't right, because they had cashed the check for the first modified payment in the same FedEx envelope. That they managed to cash the check but completely neglect the loan modification agreement—again, in the same envelope—is absolutely outrageous.

I had no choice but to apply again, this time submitting even more documents; I was told to submit and resubmit many duplicative documents in many different formats. Despite how difficult OneWest made the process, I did everything they asked because I was determined to keep my home. On August 3, 2009, I received a notice of default from OneWest but proceeded with my second attempt at modifying my loan. I received my second loan modification offer later that month. The terms were almost identical to the offer they made me in May, so I quickly signed the offer and mailed it in with another check.

In October, I got a letter exactly like the one I received earlier saying that they had not received the loan modification paperwork and that the modification offer was no longer valid. Yet as they did the first time, they cashed the check I sent with the signed offer.

At this point, I felt I had no choice but to get an attorney, who worked to get my foreclosure postponed while the loan modification process played out. He spoke with people at OneWest who told him that they would postpone the sale of my condo until the loan modification process was completed.

This simply wasn't true: on the evening of December 3, 2009, I received a knock on my door from a man that introduced himself as the new owner of my property. And in March of 2010, I received a final notice telling me that I had five days to leave my apartment—five days to pack up the ten years of my life I'd spent in my home.

The reason I am sharing my story is because there are so many other people out there like me who got left in the dust. Steve Mnuchin profited from people like me, even when we did everything we could to keep our homes. You might say that Steve Mnuchin did not personally authorize OneWest to cheat me out of my home, but his fortune rose as a direct result of managing a company that routinely engaged in irresponsible behavior.

The Treasury Secretary will be tasked with making sure the economy is working in a way that benefits all of Americans, not just the top 1 percent. However, Steve Mnuchin is not that person; he is just the opposite. Please make a statement for people like me and oppose his confirmation as Treasury Secretary.

Thank you, Cristina. Thank you for coming to Washington. Thank you for submitting your story.

Now these are just four stories—four experiences—among the thousands more like them, all leading to the same simple but startling conclusion: Under Steve Mnuchin's leadership, OneWest Bank took advantage of homeowners all across the country in the immediate aftermath of the financial crisis. And why did they do it? They did it to make a quick buck.

But don't just take my word for it. Paulina Gonzalez, the Executive Director for the California Reinvestment Coalition also came to Washington to speak to us. Paulina and her organization have been closely tracking OneWest's destructive practices for years. Here is what Paulina told us:

My name is Paulina Gonzalez. I am the Executive Director of the California Reinvestment Coalition. Over the past 30 years, CRC has grown to the largest state reinvestment coalition in the country with a membership of 300 organizations that serve low-income communities and community of color.

It is critically important that our elected representatives and the American public hear directly from people who have lost their homes due to the egregious practices by OneWest under Mr. Mnuchin's leadership, before deciding on his nomination to the high and important office of Treasury Secretary.

I'm going to share some data and information with you in the next few minutes, but know that the wreckage from OneWest is not really about numbers, data, and legal briefs. It's about the tens of thousands of Americans who have suffered devastating personal and financial losses as a result of OneWest's abusive foreclosure practices.

Whether it's the story of the Minnesota woman who sought a loan modification from OneWest and returned to her home in a blizzard only to find that her locks were changed. Or the 90 year old woman who was nearly kicked out of her home for mistakenly paying 27 cents less than [the amount] OneWest said she owed. Or the 80 year old former Christian missionary who was notified at his home that Financial Freedom was foreclosing on him because the bank said it had no record of him living there. The issue is the same: instead of helping people stay in their homes, Mr. Mnuchin devised a foreclosure machine that used every trick in the book to profit from their suffering.

And foreclose he did. CRC and Urban Strategies Council analyzed data showing that OneWest foreclosed on over 36,000 families in California and 24,000 families nationally. All of these foreclosures occurred after Mr. Mnuchin purchased IndyMac Bank. In addition, we suspect that OneWest's reverse mortgage subsidiary, Financial Freedom, has foreclosed on more seniors, widows, and widowers, and heirs than any other company participating in the federal Home Equity Conversion Mortgage program. A Freedom of Information Act request that we filed with HUD revealed that Financial Freedom had foreclosed on over 16,000 seniors, widows, widowers, and their families, or 39 % of all Home Equity Conversion Mortgage foreclosures, roughly twice the rate one would expect given the bank's market share.

I just want to say that one more time. They foreclosed on seniors, on widows, on widowers, and on families at about twice the rate of anyone else doing the same business.

Mr. Mnuchin may defend his record by saying he inherited these bad loans, that the foreclosures were inevitable, and that his bank followed the law in dealing with his customers. We strongly disagree, and it appears we are not alone. In a CNN story that aired on January 3rd about Mr. Mnuchin and

Financial Freedom, a HUD spokesperson was quoted as saying, ''while HUD doesn't dispute that it has strict rules for government backed reverse mortgages, OneWest had the ability to give survivors more time but chose not to.''

Mr. Mnuchin's spokespeople have also praised his modification record. But, we are not sure there is much to praise. 2013 data from the Treasury Department shows that OneWest had among the highest denial rates for the Home Affordable Modification Program, [HAMP,] the federal government's main foreclosure prevention effort. Under Mr. Mnuchin, OneWest denied three-quarters of the thousands of loan modification requests that came in from families trying to save their homes. OneWest was much more likely to deny loan modifications under this program than peers, such as Bank of America or Wells Fargo.

A January 2013 memo from the California Attorney General's office revealed a staff investigation finding of ''widespread misconduct'' at the bank, including backdating thousands of foreclosure documents, improper foreclosure auction credit bidding which meant the bank could claim tax exemptions it wasn't entitled to, proceeding with foreclosures without the proper authority to do so, and speeding up foreclosure timelines. All of these practices deprived working families in California a fair chance to stay in their homes.

The Treasury Secretary leads our economy. The Secretary helps oversee our banking system and will have much to say about important policies relating to banking, housing, and economic development that will impact all Americans. The country needs a Treasury Secretary who will consider the needs of all Americans, including working class Americans. Mr. Mnuchin's tenure at OneWest Bank shows him to work in his interest and in the corporate interest, at the great expense and harm to everyday Americans.

Thank you, Paulina. I appreciate your sending in this information, and I agree.

Unfortunately, Mr. Mnuchin's history of oppressive foreclosure practices isn't the only thing that disqualifies him from serving as Secretary of the Treasury. I already told you that Mr. Mnuchin flat-out lied to the Senate when he told my colleague, Senator CASEY, that his bank didn't engage in certain foreclosure practices. I wish to share an article from the Columbus Dispatch uncovering the exact practices Mr. Mnuchin told the Senate that his bank never engaged in. The article says: ''President Donald Trump's nominee for U.S. treasury secretary was untruthful with the Senate during the confirmation process, documents uncovered by The Dispatch show.''

Steve Mnuchin, former chairman and chief executive officer of OneWest Bank, known for its aggressive foreclosure practices, flatly denied in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee that OneWest used ''robo-signing'' on mortgage documents.

But records show the bank utilized the questionable practice in Ohio.

''This guy is just lying. There's no other way to say it,'' said Bill Faith, executive director of the Coalition on Homelessness and Housing in Ohio.

The revelation comes with the committee's vote on whether to confirm Mnuchin's nomination, currently scheduled for Monday night.

''Robo-signing'' is the informal term for when a mortgage company employee signs hundreds of foreclosures, swearing they have scrutinized the document as required by law when in fact they have not.

''OneWest Bank did not 'robo-sign' documents,'' Mnuchin wrote in response to questions from individual Senators, ''and as the only bank to successfully complete the Independent Foreclosure Review required by federal banking regulators to investigate allegations of 'robo-signing,' I am proud of our institution's extremely low error rate.''

I just want to read that one more time. Steve Mnuchin said: ''OneWest Bank did not 'robo-sign' documents.'' And he is proud of what he did.

But a Dispatch analysis of nearly four dozen foreclosure cases filed by OneWest in Franklin County in 2010 alone shows that the company frequently used robo-signers. The vast majority of the Columbus-area cases were signed by 11 different people in Travis County, Texas. Those employees called themselves vice presidents, assistant vice presidents, managers and assistant secretaries. In three local cases, a judge dismissed OneWest foreclosure proceedings specifically based on inaccurate robo-signings.

The Dispatch found more than 1,900 OneWest foreclosures in the state's six largest counties from 2009 to 2015.

Carla Duncan, a social worker from Cleveland Heights, was snared by OneWest's robo-signing machinery.

On her way out of town for a short trip in 2010, Duncan stopped by her home to get her mail and found a note from a field inspector for her mortgage company, saying that her house was vacant and was going to be boarded up.

''It wasn't vacant, I was living there,'' Duncan said. ''There were curtains on the windows. The radio was playing and the dog was there.''

What Duncan didn't know at the time was that OneWest had begun foreclosure proceedings on her three-bedroom home even though she was up-to-date on her payments. OneWest refused to accept a loan modification approved by a previous lender that had been purchased by OneWest, and it wanted to substantially increase Duncan's interest rate and monthly payment and add late fees. The company also put a lock box on a separate rental property she owned in Cleveland.

After hiring former Ohio Attorney General Marc Dann, waging a five-year court battle and filing personal bankruptcy, Duncan was finally able to get the foreclosures dismissed and keep her home and rental property. She said the experience was devastating.

''It got to the point that I was afraid to open my own door.''

Court records show that Duncan's mortgage was robo-signed by Erica Johnson-Seck, vice president of OneWest's department of bankruptcy and foreclosures. From her office in Austin, Texas, Johnson-Seck robo-signed an average of 750 foreclosure documents a week, according to a sworn deposition she gave in a Florida case in July 2009.

Under oath, Johnson-Seck acknowledged that she did not read the documents she was signing, taking only about 30 seconds to sign her name. To speed up the process, Johnson-Seck said she shortened her first name in her signature to just ''E.'' In the deposition that OneWest's practice was to review just 10 percent of the foreclosure documents for accuracy.

Dann, who now specializes in representing clients who have problems with banks and other lenders after he was forced to resign as attorney general nearly 10 years ago, said Mnuchin's businesses were a ''major offender'' in problem mortgages. Dann said Mnuchin's firms were known for dual tracking [which means](pursuing foreclosure simultaneously as they allegedly worked with homeowners), fabricating documents and other tactics ''that caused unbelievable devastation in people's lives.''

In 2010, federal laws were changed, enabling borrowers victimized by lenders to sue them. Dann said he worries that Mnuchin, as treasury secretary, would quietly work to repeal reforms collectively known as the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

That appears to be the case.

''It has been over six years since the passage of Dodd-Frank and it seems like an appropriate time to review all of the regulations from Dodd-Frank to understand their impact on the market, investors, small businesses and economic growth,'' Mnuchin said in a written answer to the Senate.

The Dispatch analysis showed thousands of Ohio homeowners—including 245 in Franklin County—found themselves in OneWest's crosshairs when they defaulted on their loans, the majority of them with high interest rates. Many mortgages had terms that housing and financial experts view as predatory: prepayment penalties, interest-only loans and no-money-down loans.

Mnuchin was labeled by critics at the time as the ''Foreclosure King.''

That is it—the ''Foreclosure King.'' That is who is just hours away from becoming the chief financial officer of our country.

Steve Mnuchin is a Wall Street insider who has spent his career looking out for himself and his billionaire buddies. He led a bank that forced thousands of hardworking Americans out of their homes, and he lied to the Senate.

The Constitution demands that Senators advise and consent on the President's nominations. Well, here is my advice: Steve Mnuchin is not fit to be Secretary of Treasury.

He will not look out for the millions of Americans still recovering from the recession, like Heather and Cristina. He certainly will not defend the interests of middle-class families like the McCrearys and the Olivers. And I know he will not stand up to Wall Street and fight to protect the interests of all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to oppose Mr. Mnuchin's nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Steven Mnuchin to be Secretary of the Treasury.

No Cabinet official can have such a profound impact on our economy, on family budgets, on taxes, and on consumer protection as the Secretary of the Treasury. It is a job of immense reach that requires a steady hand, a commitment to fairness, and a deep knowledge of our Nation's financial markets and the rules that protect the savings and investments of middle-class Americans. In light of this reality, I do not think Mr. Mnuchin meets these requirements.

I know that for many of my fellow Rhode Islanders and for many Americans, the economy is not producing the jobs and wages they want and they need. I share that sentiment and have pushed for job and wage policies like the minimum wage, paid leave, and health care that help struggling families cope. I have pushed for job creation by putting people to work by rebuilding our Nation's roads, bridges, transit systems, schools, and new housing. But I think it is important that everyone in this Chamber take a step back and understand where our economy was, where it is today, and what is at stake.

In 2007, the housing market began to collapse. One measure of the housing market is the seriously delinquent rate, which is the percentage of loans that are 90 days or more past due or in the process of foreclosure. Here are just a few examples of the hardest hit States: 13.2 percent in Arizona in December 2009, 9.63 percent in Ohio in December 2009, and 20.61 percent in Florida in March 2010.

By the end of President Obama's term in office, here are the seriously delinquent rates for those same States: 1.35 percent in Arizona in September of 2016, 3.59 percent in Ohio in September of 2016, and 4.14 percent in Florida in September of 2016. Just to remind on this, Florida went from a seriously delinquent rate of over 20 percent in 2010 to just over 4 percent in 2016 because of the policy, the programs that were initiated by the President and supported by this Congress.

In 2007, the unemployment rate began to skyrocket. Again, here is what that meant in a few States at their highest unemployment rates: 11.2 percent in Arizona in November of 2009, 13.6 percent in Nevada in December 2010, 11 percent in Ohio in January 2010, 11.2 percent in Florida in January 2010, and in my home State, double digit unemployment rates also.

By the end of President Obama's term in office, here are the preliminary rates for those states as of December 2016: 4.8 percent in Arizona, 5.1 percent in Nevada, 4.9 percent in Ohio, and 4.9 percent in Florida. We have seen improvement across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to take all of this into account when they consider Mr. Mnuchin.

These are sobering numbers, and behind each of these numbers is an individual or a family, our constituents, who suffered real and serious harm. We owe it to our constituents to do something so that these generational losses will be prevented from happening again. We came out of a deep abyss through difficult work, through cooperative efforts; we have reached a point where we are poised, I hope, to continue to move forward, and we don't want to go back. That was at the heart of our work on the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. It was to learn the lessons from this catastrophe so that we would never endure another in our history.

Unfortunately, for some of my constituents in Rhode Island and others around the country, the aftershocks of that financial crisis have not fully dissipated. We are still living in some respects with what happened. There are still too many looking for a decent-paying job or facing gut-wrenching financial decisions like whether to turn the heat off or to skip feeding the family another day, just to make ends meet.

Indeed, one of my constituents recently wrote:

> My wife and I lost nearly half our assets in the 2008 financial crisis. Over eight years later, and our house is still worth less than the mortgage that remains on it. We are both professionals, and will have to stay that way until we are 75 in order to come close to the standard of living we enjoy now during retirement. The financial reforms enacted under Dodd Frank, and Obama's regulation that requires financial advisers and brokers to act in their client's best interests, are critical to my family's well-being and to the health of the US economy. I would like to know how you plan to defeat any attempts to unravel these rules. Given the clear threat that Trump poses to our economy, and the losses I have already suffered due to bankers' greed and incompetence, without these rules I feel better off putting my money in my basement and will do exactly that. At least we won't lose half of what we own.

Those are the words of a professional family in Rhode Island who have seen this struggle firsthand, and they ask this question: What are you going to do to protect the reforms and the advances we have made that have been manifested in the economic statistics that I shared with my colleagues?

As you can see, for this Rhode Islander and for many others, the law we put in place to stanch the bleeding and stabilize the financial system is a critical help.

But some have so demonized Dodd-Frank that they would have you believe otherwise. That may be why its opponents prefer calling it Dodd-Frank instead of its full name, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, because it is about reforming Wall Street and protecting consumers. It is a lot easier to be against something called Dodd-Frank than it is to be against Wall Street reform and consumer protection. But as my colleagues just heard in my constituent's own words, Dodd-Frank is ''critical to my family's well-being and to the health of the US economy.''

The question I have to answer as my constituent's Senator is whether Mr. Mnuchin will support Dodd-Frank, push efforts to further reform Wall Street, and place as his highest priority the protection of consumers as our next Treasury Secretary.

Based on a review of Mr. Mnuchin's record, the answer, to me, is very clear: No, he will not.

As chairman of OneWest Bank, Mr. Mnuchin made a fortune employing questionable foreclosure practices that made the financial crisis worse for families and seniors. What is particularly worrisome is that OneWest engaged in so-called robo-signing, where companies cut crucial corners by not properly reviewing or even bothering to read foreclosure documents.

Indeed, according to one news report:

> Erica Johnson-Seck, vice president of OneWest's department of bankruptcy and foreclosures . . . robo-signed an average of 750 foreclosure documents a week, according to a sworn deposition she gave in a Florida case in July 2009 . . . Under oath, Johnson-Seck acknowledged that she did not read the documents she was signing, taking only about 30 seconds to sign her name. To speed up the process, Johnson-Seck said she shortened her first name on her signature to just an ''E.'' She said in the deposition that OneWest's practice was to review just 10 percent of the foreclosure documents for accuracy.

As part of the confirmation process, when asked whether his company engaged in robo-signing, Mr. Mnuchin responded that OneWest did not robo-sign documents. However, it is not clear that this was the case, and not just because of Ms. Johnson-Seck's deposition. Quoting from a Bloomberg article written by one of Rhode Island's finest exports, Joe Nocera, who writes: ''But here's the clincher: In 2011, the man who now says his bank never robo-signed documents signed a consent order with the Office of Thrift Supervision, which had accused it of—you guessed it—robo-signing.''

Disturbingly, Mr. Mnuchin's response on this issue either raises troubling questions about his management capabilities or his willingness to be forthright, or potentially both.

Ironically, Mr. Mnuchin's confirmation process mirrors his career in at least one way. While the Senate Finance Committee normally requires at least one Democratic Senator to be present in order to vote in committee on a nominee, the normal rules were suspended so that Mr. Mnuchin could be reported out of committee for consideration by the full Senate. In other words, the rules were not followed, special shortcuts were created for him, and much like the robo-signing that occurred at OneWest, Mr. Mnuchin is on the path to robo-confirmation without a full and proper vetting by the United States Senate.

The last thing this body should be doing is robo-stamping Mr. Mnuchin's nomination so that he, as Treasury Secretary, can change the rules and rig the system in favor of the insiders at the expense of working-class Americans who are working overtime just to, in many cases, make ends barely meet.

For example, Mr. Mnuchin has stated that his first priority would be enactment of the Trump tax plan. This plan makes deep, unfunded cuts to revenue, and roughly half of the reduced tax burden is just for the top 1 percent, the wealthy, who don't have to worry about how much a gallon of milk costs, what it costs to ride the bus or fill the gas tank. We have seen what huge tax cuts for the wealthy will do to the economy. Just look at the economy in the late 2000s and the deficit. The economic plan endorsed by President Trump and Mr. Mnuchin will not help the middle class, but will only further skew the economy in favor of the wealthy and well-connected and do precious little for job growth.

In addition, the incoming Treasury Secretary will be tasked with rolling back the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in support of a President who said:

We expect to be cutting a lot out of Dodd-Frank because, frankly, I have so many people, friends of mine that have nice businesses, and they can't borrow money. . . . They just can't get any money because the banks just won't let them borrow because of the rules and regulations in Dodd-Frank.

Indeed, Mr. Mnuchin seems all too eager to assist because he himself has said that ''we want to strip back parts of Dodd-Frank that prevent banks from lending.''

We are simply not seeing this, though. According to JPMorgan's chief financial officer, Marianne Lake, on an analyst conference call last month, ''loan growth remains robust.''

According to Bloomberg:

At JPMorgan, the biggest U.S. bank, core loans increased 10 percent to $806.2 billion last year, with gains in every category, including credit cards and wholesale debt. Bank of America Corp.'s total loans climbed 1.1 percent to $906.8 billion, while Wells Fargo & Co.'s grew 5.6 percent to $968 billion.

According to the same article, ''banks now have a record $9.1 trillion of loans outstanding.''

Based on this, it seems that big bank lending is actually doing well, and maybe the reason the President's friends have not gotten loans is that they borrowed too much and possibly have gone bankrupt too much, and the megabanks want to be careful about whom they lend to.

Indeed, Anat Admati, a finance professor at Stanford University and a member of the FDIC's Systemic Resolution Advisory Committee, notes that:

The claim that regulations are prohibiting lending is simply false. . . . The banks have plenty of money and can raise more from investors like other businesses if they have worthy loans to make. If they don't lend, it's because they choose not to lend and instead do many other things.

This is a key point. According to Bloomberg:

Banks don't actually ''hold'' capital. In banking, capital refers to the funding they receive from shareholders. Every penny of it can be loaned out. A 5 percent minimum capital requirement means that 5 percent of the bank's liabilities has to be equity, while the rest can be deposits or other borrowing. The more equity a bank has, the smaller its risk of failing when losses pile up.

Given the protection that equity provides, you are left to wonder why Mr. Mnuchin and President Trump are so anti-capital.

Indeed, from that same Bloomberg article:

Former Goldman Sachs partner Phillip D. Murphy, who was a member of the banks' management committee with [National Economic Council Director Gary] Cohn and Treasury Secretary nominee Steven Mnuchin, said he's mystified with the changes they're pushing. ''To think that undoing those regulations is going to lead to a better result is folly,'' said Murphy, who's seeking the Democratic nomination in this year's gubernatorial race. ''The fox is in the hen house, that's what this is. This is people on Wall Street who should know better.''

For an administration that campaigned on a claim of dismantling a rigged system, I am confused why President Trump nominated Mr. Mnuchin to be his economic quarterback for working-class America. Mr. Mnuchin has spent his professional life spotting value, and he has done quite well for himself. But despite this ability to value assets, Mr. Mnuchin still seems puzzled about how to value the assets that matter most to working class Americans. My constituents don't need fancy Wall Street calculators or formulas to understand that there is a value and a benefit to reforming Wall Street and keeping reckless greed in check. There is a value and a benefit to protecting consumers and their hard-earned wages. And there is a value and a benefit to keeping a family in their home and avoiding foreclosure.

Indeed, an individual who made his fortune aggressively foreclosing on his fellow Americans does not possess the right values, in my view, to be our Treasury Secretary.

Based on his record, I am not convinced Mr. Mnuchin is capable of draining the swamp, and I fear he may end up further rigging the system in favor of the 1 percent at the expense of working class Americans. For all of these reasons, I do not support Mr. Mnuchin's nomination, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting no.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield the remainder of my time to Senator WYDEN of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Madam 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. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, American families, hard-working American families need a Treasury Secretary who will work for them, not for Wall Street. Remember the tenor of the 2016 campaign, when candidate Trump, at every rally, spoke forcefully about draining the swamp. What we thought he meant was that he would drain the swamp, that he would not be hiring a whole bunch of Wall Street executives, Goldman Sachs employees, and other bankers who helped drive the economy into a ditch; that he would actually stay away from them.

In fact, we have seen the opposite. It has become obvious that the Treasury Secretary nominee Steve Mnuchin is not about hard-working American families, but he is about working for Wall Street. The Treasury Secretary has enormous influence over Americans' lives, impacting everything from their taxes to their mortgages to their retirement.

Mr. Mnuchin doesn't have a policy background to give us clues as to what he would do with his power. He was a major Trump fundraiser. Here is what we do know. He made millions as a hedge fund manager. He made millions at Goldman Sachs, where he traded mortgage securities and other products that contributed to the financial crisis. He headed what has been called a foreclosure machine, profiting in kicking hard-working Americans out of their homes.

When presented with tough questions from members of the Finance Committee in front of which he appeared, Mr. Mnuchin expected leniency and understanding from a bunch of Senators, but it is not something that he gave—leniency and understanding for Ohio families trying to keep a roof over their heads. They got the runaround from lenders with claims of lost documents, modifications that weren't honored, dual tracking. When this confirmation process began, we believe that Mr. Mnuchin and his bank, OneWest, had foreclosed on at least 40,000 people in three States. We understand—not because of information that he was willing, voluntarily at the beginning to provide—we understand now that it is at least eight States, and I expect we will learn more.

Unfortunately, he probably will be Treasury Secretary by the time a lot of this comes out because the Finance Committee didn't do its job, because Mr. Mnuchin wasn't forthcoming enough, because this Senate is trying to rush through ethically challenged candidates to be Secretaries of HHS, the EPA, Education, State, and Treasury.

OneWest's regulator, the regulator from Mr. Mnuchin's bank when he was CEO—they had shoddy mortgage practices, the regulator said. They foreclosed on more than 10,000 borrowers, including some who were current on their mortgage.

I want to put a picture up on one of the borrowers who was foreclosed on not far from where I live. The ZIP Code I live in, in Cleveland, OH, had the highest in 2007—the first half of that year, had more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States. To a bunch of U.S. Senators, that is a little troubling. A lot of foreclosures, terrible thing. But most U.S. Senators have probably never been foreclosed on, and I am guessing most U.S. Senators have never spent a lot of time socially with people who are foreclosed on. And I am guessing a whole lot of Senators have probably never even talked in detail about what it means to be foreclosed on.

Think about it. Your family is struggling. Your family lives in a home in Slavic Village, OH, a mile north of my House. And you have been working hard, you and your spouse. The parents have worked hard. The kids are teenagers—the challenges that all families have. They are making moderate incomes. The wife has her hours cut back. Then they are struggling. They have trouble paying their mortgage. They keep paying it. Then the husband has his plant closed. And in some cases, in this lady's case—I will talk about her in a moment—she was foreclosed on, not even because she lost a job. She was foreclosed on because of what Mr. Mnuchin said.

When we talk about foreclosures, we ought to think about what happens to these families. The wife maybe has hours cut back, the husband loses his job because the plant closes. Then what happens? They go to the kids and say: We have to get rid of our pet because pets cost money going to the vet, buying food, putting them for a weekend or day somewhere. They have to take the animal for somebody else to watch. So they give a pet away, which is heartbreaking to kids and to parents. Then they have to cut back on other things. Then they realize they are about to be foreclosed on or evicted. Then they have to move. They bring their son and daughter, 12 and 14 years old, in and they say: We don't know what school district you are going to be in. We don't know where you are going. We don't know if you will be around your friends because we are moving—all those things where their lives turn upside down. They lose many of their possessions. Their children's lives are so different. Their lives are turned upside down.

That is why what Mr. Mnuchin did on these 40,000 foreclosures is morally repugnant and outrageous. Yet this Senate is only 3 days away from party-line voting for this incredibly ethically challenged Secretary of the Treasury. Why? I guess listening to my Republican friends here, a number of them suggest they really don't much like this nominee. They didn't much like Secretary Price, a guy who did everything but sell stocks on the floor of the House—bought and sold health care stocks while he was working on health care legislation for those companies. They didn't much like voting for him. And a number of them wanted to vote against the Secretary of Education because she was maybe just the least qualified, as the Presiding Officer knows. She may be the least qualified Secretary of Education who has ever been nominated, but they voted for these people. Why? Because they are fearful. They are fearful of what Donald Trump will try to do to destroy their careers. You know how they know that? Because the Republican conference that meets every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday in this room right behind this door—the Republican conference—there are three Members of the Republican conference, of the 52 Senators, who ran for President against Donald Trump. They are Senators GRAHAM, RUBIO and CRUZ. All three of them were targets of Donald Trump, of Candidate Donald Trump. He insulted them, called them names, turned his supporters on them. The other—52 minus 3—the other 49 Senators know it can happen to them. That is why you are seeing these party-line votes for people as ethically challenged as Steve Mnuchin, for people who have, frankly, betrayed what trust they should have had working for a bank the way they did.

As I said, a OneWest regulator said his bank foreclosed on more than 10,000 borrowers. When I said 40,000, I misspoke. We know it was 40,000 in three States. A number of them—the OneWest regulator said something different, a smaller number that dealt with shoddy mortgage practices.

But whatever the number is here, it is in the tens of thousands. Think about that. Some of these were not even families who were struggling to keep their homes. These families were doing everything right. They paid their mortgages on time. His bank came and took their houses away because he could make more money. He did not care about these people losing their homes.

If he did not care as a banker about people losing their homes, do you think he is going to care much as Treasury Secretary about people losing their homes? Do you think he will all of a sudden develop an empathy for moderate-income people who lose their homes?

He did not have it when he was a banker making millions of dollars. One of the things that is amazing is that he came in front of our committee. You know, these gazillionaires, billionaires, whatever, who come in front of our committees have to disclose their wealth and tell us who they are and what they are.

When Secretary-designee Mnuchin came in front of the committee—get this. I know I can't talk directly to people in the gallery, but I am guessing this would not have happened to them. He forgot to disclose that he had a $100 million investment somewhere. He forgot about $100 million. I am guessing that nobody in this gallery, probably nobody on the floor, certainly no staff people back here because I know what they are paid—none of them would forget that they had a $100 million investment. Maybe he just did not want to tell us about this $100 million investment any more than he wanted to tell us about those robo-signings that I will talk about in a minute.

The report that I mentioned from the regulators said that Mr. Mnuchin's bank violated the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act by initiating foreclosure on 54 Active Duty military families. So, I mean, maybe that is worse; maybe it is not. I think it is probably even worse to foreclose on people who generally did not do anything wrong, but then he foreclosed on men and women in uniform, and put them out of their homes to pad his own bank's profits.

I would assume some of these people in the military he foreclosed on might have just been stationed overseas, protecting Mr. Mnuchin and his family, protecting me, protecting Erin and my staff, and Graham and Gideon and others; that is what they do in the military. He foreclosed on them. So, again, he had no empathy for these men and women in the service. What? He is going to care about these men and women when he is Treasury Secretary?

We now know this foreclosure was even worse than we initially thought. Around the time of the hearing, the Columbus Dispatch, Ohio's most conservative newspaper, a newspaper that always likes Republicans and rarely likes people like me—the Columbus Dispatch ran a front-page investigative story that found that OneWest used robo-signings in mortgage documents with abandon.

This, despite the fact that Mr. Mnuchin claimed in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee that his company had never done so—if you are the CEO making tens of millions of dollars a year, would you not know they did robo-signings? Wouldn't you know that they just had staff that signed, signed, signed without looking at these documents, spending an average of less than 1 minute on each document?

So you are going approve a document which might have to do with a loan to someone, and you did not even spend—as the bank, you did not even spend 60 seconds looking at this. Why? Because all of the profits were generated by volume. Quality did not matter. All the profits for this bank—or much of the profits—were generated by volume.

Ohio reporters found dozens of foreclosure cases in Franklin County alone—Columbus—that had been robo-signed. Yes, Mr. Mnuchin, in this town nobody wants to use the word I am going to use. They want to say that it was a half-truth or it was not quite right or it was fabricated. No, what Mr. Mnuchin did is lie. He said: We did not do robo-signings.

Well, the Columbus Dispatch—this was up there a moment ago—the Columbus Dispatch said he did. He lied. They say it more nicely, perhaps: Mnuchin's denials don't match the record. He lied.

Again, his lying was not just lying. It was what he lied about, and people lost their homes as a result.

Bill Faith, one of Ohio's and America's housing advocates told the Dispatch, ''The guy is just lying. There is no other way to say it.''

The guy is just lying. Since the Dispatch ran the article—this article—they have continued to report additional findings. Other reporters in other cities have uncovered more instances of robo-signings by Mr. Mnuchin's bank.

I am especially concerned about his defensiveness and outright deception when asked about this. His misconduct caused real, serious pain. That is fundamentally the big issue. It is bad that he lied to a bunch of Senators. OK. That is maybe not that big a deal. It is, but it isn't. It is bad that he lied to the American public, but he lied about something that resulted in people getting evicted, foreclosed on, thrown out of their homes—people with families, people serving in the Armed Forces. That is not enough reason for any Republican—not one Republican—to vote against him? Not one Republican?

I would like some of my colleagues to meet some of these people who were foreclosed on and have them explain to them why they are voting for Mr. Mnuchin. Is it because of fear that Donald Trump might call them out and call them a name and try to destroy their career? Apparently. I can't think of any other reason.

One victim, and I will put her name up, lives, as I said, maybe only 5 miles from where my wife and I live. She is a social worker from Cleveland Heights. Her name is Carla Duncan. She told the Dispatch, ''It got to the point that I was afraid to open my own door.''

Mr. Faith, whom I quoted before, said it has been devastating, not only to people who got caught in this kind of scheme but also to people who happened to live in the neighborhood, people like Ms. Duncan. It is scary that this man, whose bank—because of the behavior of that bank, because of a policy handed down by Mr. Mnuchin, because of a policy about which he lied—lied to the committee of the Senate, lied according to the most Republican conservative paper in Ohio, and she lost her home.

This guy is going to be the Secretary of the Treasury when he did all of that. It is scary. It is scary for hard-working families in Ohio and across the country who are still digging out from the financial crisis. I have said on this floor a number of times: ZIP Code 44105 in Cleveland where I live had more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States of America in the first half of 2007.

How can the people of Ohio of ZIP Code 44105 or any other ZIP Code in a State like mine or Nevada or Nebraska or a number of other States—how can they trust this Secretary of the Treasury who not only profited off this crisis but made it worse? How can you elevate somebody like that to being Secretary of the Treasury?

One of his employees said the bank did not have any process in place to help families avoid foreclosures. It might cost the bank some profits if they helped these families avoid foreclosure. So, what the heck—foreclosure, we make more money that way. That was Mr. Mnuchin's bottom line. His bank was not even pretending to care about the thousands of families who could lose their homes and, with them, their lives.

Lincoln once said—his staff always insisted he stay in the White House and win the war and free the slaves and preserve the Union. Lincoln said: No, I have to go out and get my public-opinion bath. In other words, I want to talk to people whose lives are affected because of the decisions that I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, make. I want to know what people's lives are like—as much as I can understand—so I can make the right decision.

Do you think that Mr. Mnuchin has spoken to these families? Do you think he has met Ms. Duncan? I assume not.

Do you think he has spoken to any of these families who lost everything when his bank took their homes and turned their lives upside down? Do you think he talked to any of them?

Do any of my Republican colleagues talk to people who have lost their homes because of something a greedy bank executive did? If any of my Republican colleagues would talk to people like Ms. Duncan, I am thinking they would not—you know the line: One bird flies off a telephone wire, they all fly off.

I am thinking my Republican colleagues would not quite all be flying off the telephone wire in unanimity and in consensus to vote for people like Stephen Mnuchin, who is ethically challenged, who has wreaked so much havoc on so many people's lives, who has shown no empathy for people, like Ms. Duncan, who were foreclosed on.

We are going to elevate him to Secretary of the Treasury because every one of my Republican colleagues is going to go: Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes—52 times. I guess that is what is happening. But it would be really nice if some of my colleagues would go and speak to the Ms. Duncans of the world and call up Mr. Mnuchin and say: Give us a list of the people you foreclosed on. We would like to talk to some of them before we vote.

I know we are voting on Monday. My colleagues, mostly, are home for the weekend. I am not sure they are going to have dinner with very many of these Ms. Duncans. I think they are probably going to have dinner at nicer places than Ms. Duncan has been able to go to because of the economic problems caused by this future Treasury Secretary.

At his confirmation hearing, Mr. Mnuchin actually said to the committee that he ''never wanted to be in the mortgage servicing business.'' It showed in his treatment of homeowners, including the Active-Duty members of our military in Ohio and across the country. It is a strange thing to say, for someone who brought a thrift that held more than $20 billion of its own mortgages and serviced $185 billion worth of mortgages in total. He said he did not want to do this, but then he bought that bank. I don't know quite what he was talking about.

It concerns me because he suggests he was more focused on turning a profit—pretty obvious. We know that. What he was doing, instead of helping Americans keep their homes was—while he was CEO of OneWest, what was he doing? He was handing out hundreds of millions of dollars in insider loans to a troubled Hollywood media company.

So on the one side he is foreclosing on people's homes. He is making a lot of money doing that. He is making a lot of money, so he had a lot of money to hand out. He is handing out hundreds of millions of dollars in insider loans to a company in Hollywood, a media company called Relativity. He was friends with the CEO of Relativity. His hedge fund, Dune, was an investor. He was cochairman of the board.

On top of all this, the FBI is investigating Relativity. A group of Relativity investors have filed a lawsuit accusing him of fraud.

It is bad enough what happened to Ms. Duncan and how he lied to the committee, not to mention the FBI investigation and all of that. A guy like that could not get elected to the Senate with his ethics challenges.

Do you know what else? He probably could not get hired in the Treasury Department or in this body with those kinds of ethics, but we are going to vote for him—52 of my colleagues, all apparently afraid of Donald Trump calling them out, giving them a nickname, and ruining their careers. They are all going to vote 52 times—52 of them—for him as Secretary of Treasury.

So let's review: False testimony, families losing their homes to a big bank's abusive practices, fraud accusations, insider loans, and this President chose Mr. Mnuchin, this President who said he is going to drain the swamp.

Mr. Mnuchin made a fortune kicking military servicemembers and seniors and working families out of their homes. He gave false testimony to the Finance Committee. With that record, what are Wall Street lawbreakers going to think when he is supposed to be the top voice on financial oversight?

He has never had empathy for people like Ms. Duncan. He really did not much care or talk to these people who lost their homes. He also won't do that as Secretary of the Treasury. He won't—I can't imagine—show any empathy toward people who are hurt by his actions.

He is also setting an example to Wall Street that now there is no sheriff in town. If you are Wall Street, you can get away with anything with this guy as Secretary of the Treasury. You can get away with anything with Steve Mnuchin as Secretary of the Treasury.

Last week, the former second in command at Goldman Sachs, Clevelander Gary Cohn, went on TV to praise the President's Executive order to start rolling back Wall Street reforms. The Executive order puts Steve Mnuchin, if he is confirmed, in change of dismantling Wall Street reform.

After the crisis, Democrats put a real cop on the beat by creating the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This independent law enforcement agency returned $12 billion in hard-earned money back to 29 million Americans. We know it works. We also know that Wall Street hates the consumer bureau.

The American people don't suffer from the same collective amnesia that Wall Street and its allies in Congress have about how devastating the crisis was for our country. The people we represent know, and Mnuchin's bank proves, when we turn the reins to Wall Street, it is working families who pay the price. Wall Street has recovered from this financial crisis. ZIP Code 44105 in Cleveland has not recovered from this financial crisis. Seniors who have lost savings haven't recovered. People who have lost jobs haven't recovered. People who have lost their homes haven't recovered.

Mr. Mnuchin has done just fine. People at Goldman Sachs have done just fine, and so many others have. I just don't know how we trust Mr. Mnuchin to rein in Wall Street.

I would ask my colleagues, in conclusion, if they believe misleading the Senate should disqualify them from confirmation because how are we going to have hearings in the future when people—they may raise their right hand and swear an oath or they may not. But it is generally expected that, if you are going to testify in the Finance Committee, you might want to tell the truth. It is kind of expected. It is kind of what you are expected to do.

But Congressman Price didn't tell the truth. Now he is the Secretary of Health and Human Services. He lied, according to the Wall Street Journal, America's most conservative mainstream newspaper. Mr. Mnuchin, came in front of the Finance Committee. He lied, according to the Columbus Dispatch, Ohio's most conservative Republican newspaper. So why should testimony to a Senate committee even matter? Why should it even matter? When you put a cop on the beat like Mr. Mnuchin, why should Wall Street get more honest instead of even less honest when it comes to abusing the public? That is my fear if Secretary Mnuchin is confirmed.

Again, I am sorry my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are just—they are afraid of this President of the United States.

In a few months, they will quit being afraid of him because they will realize the kind of President it looks like he is turning out to be. It seems to me they may be the last to learn this.

HHS SECRETARY TOM PRICE

Madam President, I want to talk for a moment about Secretary Price, now the new Secretary of Health and Human Services and just read a couple of letters from people in Ohio and what this would mean to them.

A family physician from Cleveland, OH, wrote me:

> I have seen firsthand the benefits of Medicaid expansion here in Ohio. I also have a son who has had three brain surgeries and has epilepsy as a result. His ability to get health insurance in the future is a very real worry.

He is concerned about Dr. Price as Secretary of Health and Human Services. He said:

> His past record of trying to dismantle the ACA and his opposition to women's reproductive health rights disqualify him.

Another family wrote from Medina, OH, about the confirmation of Congressman Price to be Secretary:

> The ACA protections of coverage pre-existing conditions and removal of lifetime caps were an absolute lifesaver for me, literally.
>
> As my disease has progressed, I have required multiple new medications and treatments. Currently, my yearly maintenance medications cost nearly $400,000. That doesn't include additional appointments, testing, IV medications. . . .
>
> Prior to the ACA being passed, I had a lifetime cap of 1 million dollars. If this cap came back—

And my colleagues want to repeal it. If this cap came back and they reestablish the cap, reestablish the denial of coverage for preexisting conditions—

> If this cap came back, my insurance will last possibly less than 2 years. Then what?
>
> My husband and children will already lose me in the coming years, regardless. I am simply asking that they not be forced to lose everything else in the process.

So I hope we have learned from a really bad decision last night on confirmation. I would hope that just two or three or four Republicans could break from this party-line train running through this body, stand up for the right things, stand up against the ethical challenges of this nominee. I understand the President may call names, may tweet about them, may try to ruin their careers. Show some courage. Show some guts, and do the right thing. Vote no on Steven Mnuchin for Secretary of Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I want to compliment my friend, the Senator from Ohio, for his comments. I know my friend, the Senator from Washington, is going to make comments after this, so I will try to make mine as brief as possible.

I apologize. I joined the majority of Senators who are a little bit raspy today after our late night last night.

I rise in opposition to the nomination of Steven Mnuchin to serve as our Nation's next Secretary of the Treasury.

As the President's principal economic adviser, the Treasury Secretary holds a special significance in our system of government. The Treasury Department must ensure America's debts are paid, secure our role as a global economic power, and develop policies that help build an economy that works for all Americans.

Based on Mr. Mnuchin's record, my meeting with him, along with his answers during the Senate Finance hearing and followup questions, I am unable to support his nomination to serve as Treasury Secretary.

I want to take time today to discuss some specific policy issues that Mr. Mnuchin and I disagree with and some of the areas where I hope that if he is confirmed, we might be able to find common ground.

On financial reform and protecting the economy from too big to fail, Mr. Mnuchin's comments, coupled with comments and announcements from others in the administration, are deeply concerning.

Mr. Mnuchin's statements of ''concern'' about title II of Dodd-Frank, in particular, revealed to my mind, at least, a disturbing lack of understanding about how the financial system has evolved since the 2008 crash.

We should never forget that Lehman Brothers' collapse caused enough uncertainty across the financial system to trigger a run on nearly every other bank. The Lehman collapse also was part of the requirements that required that $700 billion much fabled taxpayer bailout.

The resulting financial chaos destroyed millions of jobs, devastated home values, and froze lending to consumers and small businesses. The truth is, many Americans are still trying to dig their way out of that financial crisis.

To ensure that taxpayers didn't end up on the hook again for another bailout, Congress passed Dodd-Frank that required banks to put in additional financial capital to make sure there were living wills so these large, significant financial institutions actually had ways that they could resolve themselves and, in a sense, get ready for bankruptcy. But we also said, in the event that bankruptcy was not adequate, there would be, as a cause of last resort, the ability using the FDIC to unwind these large institutions.

Well, we are years later and what we have seen is that other countries around the globe had basically modeled their systems after what we created in terms of title I and II in Dodd-Frank.

Since 2010, our regulators have worked diligently with the Bank of England and other foreign counterparts to ensure a global megabank can be resolved without using taxpayer dollars.

I would further note that even the National Bankruptcy Conference, which is composed of bankruptcy judges, lawyers, and academics, believe ''orderly liquidation authority under Title II should continue to be available, even if the bankruptcy code is amended.''

Unfortunately, Mr. Mnuchin and other members of the administration have expressed great concern with title II, and that causes me concern in terms of his nomination.

In tax reform, the Secretary of the Treasury has also historically played an important role. I have long argued that our Tax Code is broken. It is simply not working for enough Americans and American businesses.

I would welcome efforts to smartly—and on a bipartisan basis—work to reform the Tax Code, but I am concerned about how a tax reform process under this administration might play out.

First, Mr. Mnuchin has repeatedly said there should be no absolute tax cut for the upper class. I found that good. Some have even started to call this the ''Mnuchin rule.''

As the nominee, though, he has failed to commit to following his own rule or to provide any specific answer on how he would reduce the tax burden on middle class and working families. In fact, President Trump campaigned on a plan that based upon independent budget analysis, would add close to $5 trillion to our national debt and that would, in the same amount, slash taxes for corporations and those at the top of the income scale. Yet this same plan and any effort to be revenue-neutral would end up then raising taxes on middle-class families.

The truth is, again, an independent analysis of President Trump's plan shows that while middle-class earners might see a smaller increase in their aftertax income, the increase and the benefits to the upper 1 percent would be where most of the benefits went to. That is before we even get to issues like the President's plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act and the implications that has for middle-class Americans.

Because of this and because of his unwillingness to explain how we would pay for this tax reform and the notion that somehow through dynamic scoring this would all, in effect, self-correct leaves me with great concerns. I would simply point out to my colleagues that when Mr. Camp proposed a tax reform plan that I didn't agree with—but it at least had some basis in financial reality—there were eight separate dynamic scoring plans put together; in effect, magic dust that could somehow resolve even big tax cuts that would suddenly, somehow mysteriously pay for themselves.

We saw the effects of that kind of action with the Bush tax cuts early in 2003. We have seen this well in terms of actions that have led our country to $20 trillion in debt.

So I believe that Mr. Mnuchin's failure to come through with a truly revenue-neutral or legitimate plan that would not misuse dynamic scoring raises enormous concern as well.

Finally, I am concerned that Mr. Mnuchin lacks an understanding of the critical role the Treasury Department plays in both crafting and implementing economic standards.

It was useful to hear that Mr. Mnuchin committed to 100 percent sanctions during his nomination. I am not sure, with some of the actions of the administration since then, if we can actually hold him to those commitments.

Treasury obviously has a role that is much more important than just enforcement. Treasury's role vis-a-vis Iran, Treasury's role vis-a-vis the Russian sanctions are extraordinarily important in his unwillingness, particularly around Russia, to make a firm commitment. Again, this raises a clear concern for me, and this is a concern that is shared by both Democratic and Republican Members of the Senate who feel that we need to keep the pressure on Mr. Putin's behavior not only in the Middle East but in Ukraine and, candidly, Russia's unprecedented involvement and interference in our own election.

Again, the Treasury Secretary plays an important and critical role.

There are areas—let me make clear though—where, if Mr. Mnuchin is confirmed, I hope to work with him, and that one area in particular is housing finance.

I believe very strongly—and having worked with many Members on the other side—that we need to reform our housing finance system so we don't have, in the case of Fannie and Freddie, instances where when times are going good, there is private sector gain, but when crisis happens, the taxpayer pays the bill.

We saw this take place back in 2008, where the American taxpayers literally had to put up $188 billion of taxpayer money to bail out Fannie and Freddie.

It is true, many years later, most of those funds have been repaid, but as somebody who spent longer as a venture capitalist than I have as a Senator, I can assure you, the taxpayer did not get fair return on those funds that were taken out in the midst of the crisis.

Now we see certain hedge funds were trying to take advantage of this arbitrage, buy in to Freddie and Fannie, and then hope that policymakers will turn a blind eye and simply return to the old style of doing business, where as long as things are going well, hedge funds and others will do well by owning Fannie and Freddie, but if the stuff hits the fan again, taxpayers will be caught holding the bill.

I was happy to hear—and I was pleased to hear that Mr. Mnuchin went on record during the Finance hearing, opposing the so-called recap and release plan and was supporting a bipartisan solution to reform these entities.

Again, if Mr. Mnuchin is confirmed, I look forward to working with him in this area.

Finally, there is an area that I think most of us on both sides of the aisle realize that we can't play Russian roulette with and that is dealing with our debt ceiling. Here again was an area where I would actually give Mr. Mnuchin some credit because he acknowledged that the notion that some have put forward that if America would prioritize to pay one bill and not another is both financially unsound and practically impossible. On that item, I want to give Mr. Mnuchin his due.

On balance, because of some of the comments that Mr. Mnuchin has made around tax reform, around sanctions, around the issues related to making sure we have a vigorous and independent Treasury, I don't believe he brings the characteristics and qualities needed to be a Treasury Secretary. So I will not be able to support his nomination, and I will urge my colleagues in joining me to oppose him when his vote comes up on Monday.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I come to the floor this afternoon with my colleagues to speak about the nomination of Steve Mnuchin for the Secretary of Treasury.

We all know this is a very important economic position in our Federal Government, but it is also a position of great importance for the entire world economy. The Secretary of Treasury is a key Presidential adviser on important economic and tax policy, and has an impact on the lives of millions of people across the United States. But most importantly, the Secretary will be on the front lines protecting and restoring our economy from the unbelievable economic crisis that we faced in 2008.

I like to say that this crisis—which, according to the Dallas Fed, which cost us $14 trillion—is not over. That is, average Americans still have not recovered from the crisis when it comes to their 401(k) or their pension or the opportunity to send their kids to school or perhaps even homeownership. It is very important that we have a Treasury Secretary who not only says that they will protect the United States in the future from another financial crisis, but that they are also on the job making sure we restore economic opportunities for everyday Americans.

I would have to say that Mr. Mnuchin certainly has lived the American dream. You would say that he is a man who has achieved financial success. But is he going to fight for the average American who has not achieved that success because of the economic downturn in 2008? Is he going to make sure that our resources and dollars not only grow the economy, but make sure that those who have been impacted the most are restored in some way?

I personally did not support the bailout of the banks. I did not give the keys of the Treasury to those big organizations, and many people in the State of Washington and across America during this last campaign want to know why they did not receive financial help during that downturn, but people were so willing to bail out these large organizations. So it is very important that we look at the nomination today in light of what has transpired and what we are going to do moving forward to help the economic security of so many Americans.

This position, which includes chairing the Financial Stability Oversight Council and moderating systemic risk to our entire financial system, is a very big job. It requires someone with both expertise in policy and experience in public service, as well, because you are balancing these issues for the public.

I find it sometimes very difficult to explain in detail those policies to my constituents, particularly about balancing the public interest, when they have seen that all some want to do, as I said, is give the keys to the Treasury to those large financial organizations. There is a lot to talk about that here today.

In my opinion the Treasury Department needs a seasoned and experienced public servant who understands our ship has been sailing through turbulent waters, and will focus on making sure that America returns to economic stability.

I had an opportunity to meet with the Treasury Secretary nominee. He has admitted throughout his confirmation hearing that he was the chief fundraiser for President Trump during his election. In fact, when I asked him why he wanted to be Treasury Secretary, he told me that he had spent many hours campaigning with the President-elect around the United States and he wanted to continue that relationship. This isn't exactly the type of experience that I am looking for. I want somebody who is going to continue to help us dig out of those economic problems that plague so many average Americans—on many issues, whether it is pensions or investing in education or growing our economy at a robust rate, that bring everybody up to a higher economic standard of living.

One issue that plagues me the most in thinking about this particular nominee is the issue of Glass-Steagall, the separation of commercial and investment banking.

Why would that issue be so important?

It is so important because this was the law of the land for more than 60 years in the United States of America after the Great Depression. Why? Because people understood we should not be putting individual savings—and taxpayer money—at risk when you have a financial crisis. So we implemented that law of the land.

I have not been shy about trying to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reinstate Glass-Steagall, and, during the financial regulatory reform debate, make sure we were putting strong laws on the books. I always felt that there would be a time when average Americans really could look back on all that Congress had done and say they were satisfied or dissatisfied with the rules that were in place.

Well, I think that time happened during the last election. There was a lot of discussion that while we had passed what was then called Dodd-Frank—the regulatory reform that this Congress passed, I felt like we could do more. A lot of the discussion was that Dodd-Frank didn't go far enough, that somehow we needed to do more. The compromise shaped here in the Senate, was said by some people, was as much as we could do, and that we should put those rules in place and see how they worked for the U.S. economy. I supported it because it was enough to get on the books, to start getting disclosure, to start making sure that these transactions would have more oversight, but I never thought—never thought—it was the bright line that we needed to separate commercial and investment banking.

So you can imagine that it was to my great delight when I saw last summer the debate between the Republican and Democratic platforms in which the Republican platform actually started to embrace Glass-Steagall. They had a campaign, they had a Presidential candidate, and they certainly had a Presidential campaign manager who were all embracing it and touting it. I don't know if that was an effort to try to distinguish between some of the candidates on the other side of the aisle, or my colleague from Vermont who has also been a big supporter of Glass-Steagall, but they clearly put in their platform something that was unambiguous. It basically said: ''We support reinstating the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933, which prohibits commercial banks from being engaged in high-risk investment.'' That is what their platform said, and that is what our now-President's then campaign manager also said they were for. That caught my ear because I thought maybe we had finally reached a point with the frustration of the American public about how they had been left behind after the financial crisis, and that they finally were seeing two candidates and several campaigns talking about this issue, putting it in their platform, and moving ahead.

It was the Trump campaign manager who said:

> ''We are supporting the small banks and Main Street. We talk about legislation that affects, you know, some of the mistakes that were made in repealing Glass-Steagall.''

This was the party platform of the other side of the aisle. In fact I have to say I almost thought it was probably a better platform than we had on the Democratic side, and I wanted to make sure that my colleagues knew and understood that. But now I see that it was nothing more than a cynical ploy to try to convince the American people that somehow the Trump administration was really going to be on the side of Main Street against Wall Street.

In fact, one of my first conversations with Secretary-nominee Mr. Mnuchin was to ask him whether he in fact supported Glass-Steagall. He said to me: No, that was just a campaign promise in our platform. That is not what we are going to do.

That caught me by surprise because I really had hoped that maybe President Trump, having been in business, having seen the challenges of working with big banks, maybe was really going to be on the side of Main Street, was really going to fight to make sure that we protected the capital that needed to go into small business, that needed to go into investment, that needed to go into new products and manufacturing, and protect us from those kinds of Wall Street shenanigans.

My constituents want to make something in America besides exotic financial instruments. They want those dollars to be invested in small businesses that are creating products and selling them in a worldwide market.

Mr. Mnuchin, instead, came to the Finance Committee and basically said he is not for that version of what was in their party platform. In fact, he and the President now support rolling back the minimal law that we put on the books, known as the Volcker rule, within Dodd-Frank. So, the fact is that not only are they not supporting what we were led to believe they did support, but they are now putting someone in the position of the chief economic official on these issues, who is saying: Let's start rolling back the regulations that already exist.

So I am very frustrated by that, and I can say just on that point alone that I would oppose Mr. Mnuchin's nomination to be Treasury Secretary. I think it is time that we have someone who is not like putting the fox in the hen house, but is instead there to do the job and will protect our investment in the future and hopefully unwind this economic problem from the past.

There are other reasons, though, why I don't support Mr. Mnuchin's nomination to Treasury Secretary, and many of my colleagues here this morning have already talked about that as related to the economic crisis. OneWest Bank, with Mr. Mnuchin as chair, booked billions in profits on the backs of foreclosure victims. According to reports, Mr. Mnuchin's investors pocketed nearly $4 billion in the time they controlled the bank. Mr. Mnuchin reportedly made $100 million when he sold OneWest in 2015 for double what he paid the government.

We saw this in the Northwest, and I can tell you it was a great frustration. These profits were booked on the backs of thousands of struggling Americans, and we don't know exactly how these people suffered because we don't have all the information.

The victims of OneWest are at least 50,000, including 1,600 in the State of Washington. OneWest used ethically troubling and actually illegal methods to seize homes from struggling homeowners and not give them a fair process.

Under their agreement with regulators, they were supposed to modify mortgages whenever possible and keep people in their homes. However, according to the California attorney general, OneWest engaged in ''widespread misconduct'' to kick many people out of their homes. Even Mr. Mnuchin admitted this. In 2011 he signed a consent order with the U.S. Office of Thrift Supervision that found that OneWest had filed or caused to be filed potentially false affidavits ''not based on personal knowledge or review of relevant books and records.''

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD one of these actual agreements.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR THE COUNTY OF KING

CIT BANK, N.A., Plaintiff, vs. YVONNE C CARR, an individual; MIDLAND FUNDING LLC, a limited liability company; and all other persons, parties, or occupants unknown claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the real property described in the complaint herein, adverse to Plaintiff's title, or any cloud on Plaintiff's title to the Property.—Defendants.

CASE NUMBER: COMPLAINT FOR JUDICIAL FORECLOSURE OF DEED OF TRUST

Plaintiff alleges as follows:

1. Plaintiff, CIT BANK, N.A., (''Plaintiff) is a corporation duly authorized to conduct business in the State of Washington.

2. Defendant YVONNE C CARR, an individual (hereinafter referred to as ''Defendant'') is a resident of King County, Washington.

3. Defendant MIDLAND FUNDING LLC is a limited liability company doing business in the state of Oregon.

4. Venue is proper in this action as the Defendant resides in King County and the property that is the subject of this Complaint is located in King County.

5. Defendant is the record owner of the real property commonly known as: 4916 48TH AVE SOUTH, SEATTLE, WA 98118 (''Property'') and legally described as: ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT ''1.''

6. On or about November 9, 2010 the Defendant, for valuable consideration, made, executed, and delivered to EAGLE HOME MORTGAGE LLC (''Eagle Home Mortgage LLC'') a promissory note. A copy of the Note is attached as Exhibit ''2.''

7. At the same time that the Defendant executed and delivered the Note, and as part of the same transaction, the Defendant, in order to secure payment of the Note, made, executed, and delivered to Eagle Home Mortgage LLC a Deed of Trust encumbering the Property, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein as Exhibit ''3'' (''Deed of Trust''). The Deed of Trust was recorded on November 15, 2010 with the King County Auditor under Instrument No. 20101115001766.

8. Defendant MIDLAND FUNDING LLC, has, or claims to have, some interest in the subject property or some part thereof by reason of a judgment in the amount of $1,353.05. Said judgment was entered by King County Circuit Court on January 26, 2015 and relates to case no. 145–16318.

9. Plaintiff is holder of the Note and assignee of the Deed of Trust.

10. As of January 29, 2016 the balance due and owing is $230,364.41 plus interest at 5.390% per diem, which continues to accrue until paid. The amount due is comprised of the following:

Principal Advances	$167,175.00
Accrued Interest	$53,842.70
Initial MIP	$4,352.00
Monthly MIP	$4,994.71
Grand Total	$230,364.41

11. Plaintiff has exercised and does hereby exercise the option granted in the Note and Deed of Trust to declare the whole of the balance of both the principal and interest thereon due and payable, as the property has ceased to be the principal residence of the borrower.

12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that All Other Persons, Parties, or Occupants Unknown Claiming any Legal or Equitable Right, Title, Estate, Lien, or Interest in the Real Property Described in the Complaint Herein, Adverse to Plaintiff's Title, or any Cloud on Plaintiff's Title to the Property are individuals having a subordinate claim or interest in the Property. The interests of said Defendant in the Property shall be eliminated at the time of the foreclosure sale by Plaintiff. As of the date of the filing of this Complaint, the identities of these Defendants are not known. Once the identities of these Defendants are known, these pleadings will be amended to reflect their true names,

13. No other suit or action has been instituted or is now pending upon said Note or to foreclose the Deed of Trust.

14. The terms of the Note and Deed of Trust provide that, in the event of any action to collect the same or to foreclose the Deed of Trust, there shall be included in the Judgment a reasonable sum for attorney's fees, together with all expenses incurred in pursuing a default action and including the costs of title evidence.

15. Plaintiff is entitled to judgment permitting it to bid all or part of its judgment sale.

16. Plaintiff does not seek a monetary judgment against Defendant MIDLAND FUNDING, LLC. Rather, Plaintiff seeks to foreclose its deed of trust which secures its promissory note against the Property, and extinguish all subordinate interests in the property thereby.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for Judgment against Defendants as follows:

1. For judgment in the sum of $230,364.41 together with interest from January 29, 2016 at the rate of 5.930% per diem, late charges, and for such other sums advanced under the terms of the Note and Deed of Trust, for taxes, assessments, municipal charges, and other items which may constitute liens on the Property, together with insurance and repairs necessary to prevent impairment of the security, attorney's fees and costs of reasonable and necessary amounts, if this matter is uncontested, or as submitted by counsel, and such other amounts as the Court shall deem reasonable in case this action is contested, together with the costs and disbursements herein;

2. It be adjudged, in the event of non-payment of the judgment forthwith upon its entry, that the Deed of Trust be declared as valid first lien upon the land and premises described herein; that the Deed of Trust be foreclosed and that the Property covered thereby sold at a foreclosure sale in the manner provided by law, and the proceeds thereof be applied on said judgment and increased interest and such additional amounts as the Plaintiff may advance for taxes, assessments, municipal charges, and such other items as may constitute lien upon the Property, together with insurance and repairs necessary to prevent impairment of the security, together with interest thereon from the date of payment;

3. By such foreclosure and sale, the rights, claims, ownership, liens, and demands of each of the Defendants and persons claiming by, through or under them subsequent to the execution of the Deed of Trust should be adjudged inferior and subordinate to the Deed of Trust lien and be forever foreclosed, except only for the statutory right of redemption allowed by law and surplus funds allowed by law, if any;

4. The Plaintiff be permitted to become a bidder and purchaser at the foreclosure sale;

5. Adjudging that each of the Defendants and all persons claiming under each Defendant, after execution of the Deed of Trust, whether as lien claimant, judgment creditor, claimant under a junior trust deed, purchaser, lien holder, or otherwise be barred and foreclosed from all rights, claims, interests, or equity of redemption in the Property and every part of the Property when the time for redemption has elapsed;

6. For an Order directing the Sheriff, after the time for redemption has elapsed, to execute a deed to the purchaser of the Property at the sale, and directing that any such purchaser be let into possession of the Property upon production of the Sherriff's Deed;

7. For an Order eliminating such redemption rights should the subject property be found vacant for at least 6 months prior to application for judgment; and

8. For such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

DATED: February 9, 2016

Respectfully Submitted,

MALCOLM ◆ CISNEROS, A Law Corporation.

Nathan F. Smith, WSBA. #43160, Attorneys for Plaintiff, MALCOLM ◆ CISNEROS, A Law Corporation.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KING, STATE OF WASHINGTON

CIT BANK, N.A., Plaintiff/Petitioner, vs. Yvonne C. Carr, an individual; et al., Defendant/Respondent.

Cause No. 16–2–03164 1.

Hearing Date:

DECLARATION OF SERVICE OF NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF AN ACTION; SUMMONS; COMPLAINT FOR JUDICIAL FORECLOSURE OF DEED OF TRUST; DECLARATION OF NON-MILITARY STATUS.

The undersigned hereby declares: That s(he) is now and at all times herein mentioned was a citizen of the United States, over the age of eighteen, not an officer of a plaintiff corporation, not a party to nor interested in the above entitled action, and is competent to be a witness therein.

On the 23rd day of February, 2016 at 12:50 PM at the address of 4916 48TH AVE. S., SEATTLE, King County, WA 98116; this declarant served the above described documents upon YVONNE C. CARR by then and there personally delivering 1 true and correct copy(ies) thereof, by then presenting to and leaving the same with YVONNE C. CARR, Who accepted service, with identity confirmed by verbal communication, a black female approx. 55–65 years of age, 5'4''–5'6'' tall, weighing 120–140 lbs with brown hair.

No information was provided or discovered that indicates that the subjects served are members of the United States military.

Service Fee Total: $ 75.00.

Declarant hereby states under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the statement above is true and correct.

DATED 2/23/16.

Joshua Douglas, Reg. # 1418458, King County.

Ms. CANTWELL. This is an actual foreclosure document from one of my constituents. What is most amazing about this is that they are basically saying that this property should be seized and foreclosed on, saying that there was no one living there. But when one actually sees the service of the document, the service of the document shows that it was served at an address where somebody answered the door and took the document. So even in and of itself, you can see how ludicrous this operation was—just going through a robo-list of names, signing documents, and putting people out of their homes, when in reality, they were there living in them and should not have been foreclosed on.

Many of these behaviors have been described by my colleagues, and I hope that we get to the bottom of this issue. We heard from victims of a foreclosure, where on a 98-year-old woman, being 27 cents short on a payment, and another where they changed the locks on her home in Minnesota in the middle of a blizzard.

Is that what we did for Goldman Sachs? I don't think so. I think we gave them the keys to the Treasury.

This behavior, the callousness of this issue, is another reason why I cannot support Mr. Mnuchin's nomination for Treasury Secretary.

Mr. Mnuchin's answers to questions about the administration's tax reform plan are another issue. His tax reform policy and that of the administration just doesn't add up to me. The nonpartisan analysts who have looked at the President's tax reform plan found that it would do just the opposite of what Mr. Mnuchin says, and it would actually increase the deficit by $7.2 trillion over 10 years.

I don't think those are economics that I can support, and I don't think I can support his nomination.

I would just say, in concluding, that there are other issues that also concern me with this nominee and his responsibility to help us solve our economic challenges.

I did have a chance to talk to Mr. Mnuchin about our pension programs. One-third of Americans have zero retirement savings or a pension plan—one-third. Those who do are not saving nearly enough and the median balance for those nearing retirement is only $14,500. This is going to be a crisis for us.

According to the National Institute on Retirement Security, our nation's retirement savings gap is somewhere between $6.8 trillion and $14 trillion. That is the gap that we are looking at in the United States.

So, yes, when the Dallas Fed says that bailing out Wall Street and the implosion of the Wall Street problems cost our economy $14 trillion, and that just happens to be the same gap in pensions and retirement savings, it makes me furious.

I want to see a Treasury Secretary who has a plan on how we are going to deal with these issues. The Secretary of the Treasury sits on the Board of Directors of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. They make important decisions as it relates to the multi-employer pension plans and the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act. The PBGC currently has a deficit of $76 billion.

These issues are so important, not just to mineworkers but to average Americans. When Mr. Mnuchin sat on the board of Sears, he oversaw the finances of the company's pension, which was massively underfunded and accumulated $8.3 billion in net losses. We cannot afford to let that happen to the PBGC.

If that is not enough, I want a Treasury Secretary who is going to be aggressive in protecting the American taxpayer from further cause and effects of the crisis in Puerto Rico. I was not a fan of the plan that we crafted here in the Congress. Why? Because, again, we gave Wall Street all the opportunity and left the taxpayers of the United States and Puerto Rico with all the cost. That is going to be a challenge for all of us in the future, and I hope that we will have a Treasury Secretary who will be aggressive in recouping our losses as taxpayers from Wall Street.

So while I know that people here and on the other side of the aisle think their minds are made up, I would just ask them to look at his record, to look at what we need to do as a country to move our economy forward to recoup from the financial crises, and to say that Mr. Mnuchin is not the man to lead us where we need to go. He certainly has realized his financial dreams, but we have not heard enough from him that makes me convinced he is going to help Americans realize theirs.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam 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 KATHERINE JOHNSON AND REMEMBERING MARY JACKSON AND DOROTHY VAUGHAN

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, in honor of African-American History Month and in support of efforts to promote education and training in 21st century careers involving science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, I want to bring the attention of this body to the stories of three remarkable African-American women. Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughan, and Mary Jackson broke through barriers of gender and race as trailblazers at NASA's Langley Research Center in Hampton, VA, more than a half century ago. Together with my colleagues Senator TIM KAINE and Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, we honor these women.

Before John Glenn orbited Earth or Alan Shepherd walked on the Moon, several hundred female mathematicians used pencil and paper, slide rules, and adding machines to perform the complex equations which launched America's journey into space. Among these ''human computers,'' as they were known, were Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughan, and Mary Jackson—three women who have become symbols for many other women, many of them women of color, who worked at NASA Langley's West Area Computing Group complex and helped America dominate space and aeronautics research.

Virginia author Margot Lee Shetterly grew up surrounded by this little-known history, much of it relayed by her father, who also was an internationally recognized scientist with NASA's Langley Research Center. And Shetterly masterfully tells the story in her book ''Hidden Figures'', which currently is an Academy Award nominated motion picture of the same name.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughan, and Mary Jackson shared a combined 95 years of experience in the field of aeronautics and space exploration. Katherine Johnson worked as an aerospace technologist from 1953 until she retired in 1986. Dorothy Vaughan worked as a mathematician and programmer from 1943 until her retirement in 1971. Mary Jackson also worked as a computer and an engineer from 1951 until her retirement in 1985. Over the course of their careers at NASA, Johnson, Vaughan, and Jackson coauthored more than three dozen scientific papers.

In her role as a ''computer,'' Katherine Johnson calculated the trajectory for Alan Shepard, the first American in space. Even after NASA began calculating trajectories with electronic computers, John Glenn personally requested that Johnson recheck those calculations before the Friendship Seven flight in which he became the first American to orbit the Earth. ''If she says they're good, then I'm ready to go,'' Glenn said during the preflight check, and once he got the word from Katherine Johnson, Friendship Seven roared off a launch pad and into American history. Katharine Jackson later would play key roles in the success of America's Apollo and space shuttle programs.

Dorothy Vaughan left her job as a math teacher at Prince Edward County, Virginia's segregated Moton High School in 1943 for what she thought would be a temporary job with the agency that would later become NASA. Vaughan became NASA's first African-American manager in 1949 and the first African-American supervisor at the fledgling space agency. When NASA transitioned to electronic computing, Vaughan transitioned with it, becoming an expert FORTRAN programmer and training others within her department on the early computer programming language.

Mary Jackson was first hired at NASA by Dorothy Vaughan, and after 2 years in the segregated computing pool, she was provided an opportunity to work with internationally recognized engineers in Langley's wind tunnels. That exposure led to her interest in engineering, and she successfully petitioned Hampton City Council for permission to enroll in graduate level coursework offered only at night and only at the then-segregated Hampton High School. Not only did she successfully complete the coursework, Mary Jackson became NASA's first Black female engineer in 1958. Twenty years later, she would cap her career by working to further improve hiring and promotion opportunities for women across the entire space agency.

Mr. WARNER. Thanks to Margot Lee Shetterly's book and the popularity of the film, these hidden figures are hidden no longer. And the stories of Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughan, and Mary Jackson reflect America's story: the powerful combination of individual drive and accomplishment and the certain knowledge that America is at its very best when we are inclusive and welcome everyone's contributions of capability and talent.

The stories of Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughan, and Mary Jackson also provide compelling testimony to support our bipartisan efforts to promote education and training in the STEM disciplines: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Those are the disciplines which will continue to provide the opportunities of the future, and these are the disciplines where we must do a much better job of recruiting and retaining young women, especially girls of Color.

It is an honor to place in the record of this body the stories of these exceptionally talented individuals. They were among the brightest minds of their generation, and their intellect and their collective body of work helped change America's future.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 590. An act to foster civilian research and development of advanced nuclear energy technologies and enhance the licensing and commercial deployment of such technologies; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 58. A resolution congratulating the New England Patriots on their victory in Super Bowl LI; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 59. A resolution expressing the support for the designation of February 12, 2017, as ''Darwin Day'' and recognizing the importance of science in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 253, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 265

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 265, a bill to prevent conflicts of interest that stem from executive Government employees receiving bonuses or other compensation arrangements from nongovernment sources, from the revolving door that raises concerns about the independence of financial services regulators, and from the revolving door that casts aspersions over the awarding of Government contracts and other financial benefits.

S. 315

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to place in Arlington National Cemetery a monument honoring the helicopter pilots and crewmembers who were killed while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 344

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to employers who provide paid family and medical leave, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 58—CONGRATULATING THE NEW ENGLAND PATRIOTS ON THEIR VICTORY IN SUPER BOWL LI

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 58

Whereas, on Sunday, February 5, 2017, the New England Patriots (in this preamble referred to as the ''Patriots'') won Super Bowl LI by a score of 34 to 28, defeating the Atlanta Falcons in Houston, Texas;

Whereas, during the second half of Super Bowl LI, the Patriots scored 31 consecutive points, overcoming the largest deficit that any team has overcome in Super Bowl history;

Whereas the victory in Super Bowl LI earned the Patriots their fifth Super Bowl championship;

Whereas Tom Brady—

(1) broke, tied, or extended several Super Bowl records in leading the Patriots to their fifth Super Bowl victory; and

(2) was named the Super Bowl Most Valuable Player for a record fourth time;

Whereas James White set new Super Bowl records by catching 14 passes and scoring 20 points, including the game-winning touchdown run in overtime;

Whereas Bill Belichick won an unprecedented fifth Super Bowl title as a head coach;

Whereas the performance of the defense in the second half was critical to the Patriots' victory in Super Bowl LI, and key plays by Trey Flowers, Dont'a Hightower, and Alan Branch contributed to shutting out the Atlanta Falcons for the final 23 minutes and 36 seconds of regulation;

Whereas Julian Edelman hauled in a miracle catch for the ages to continue a fourth quarter drive by the Patriots, helping to send the game to overtime;

Whereas Robert Kraft, the owner of the Patriots, eloquently stated, ''Two years ago, we won our fourth Super Bowl down in Arizona and I told our fans that was the sweetest one of all. . . . But I want to say to our fans, to our brilliant coaching staff, our amazing players who were so spectacular, this is unequivocally the sweetest''; and

Whereas the Patriots ''did their job'' again and took ''no days off'', delivering a fifth Lombardi Trophy to New England: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate congratulates the New England Patriots on their dramatic victory in Super Bowl LI.

SENATE RESOLUTION 59—EXPRESSING THE SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 12, 2017, AS ''DARWIN DAY'' AND RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENCE IN THE BETTERMENT OF HUMANITY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 59

Whereas Charles Darwin developed the theory of evolution by the mechanism of natural selection, which, together with the monumental amount of scientific evidence Charles Darwin compiled to support the theory, provides humanity with a logical and intellectually compelling explanation for the diversity of life on Earth;

Whereas the validity of the theory of evolution by natural selection developed by Charles Darwin is further strongly supported by the modern understanding of the science of genetics;

Whereas it has been the human curiosity and ingenuity exemplified by Charles Darwin that has promoted new scientific discoveries that have helped humanity solve many problems and improve living conditions;

Whereas the advancement of science must be protected from those unconcerned with the adverse impacts of global warming and climate change;

Whereas the teaching of creationism in some public schools compromises the scientific and academic integrity of the education systems of the United States;

Whereas Charles Darwin is a worthy symbol of scientific advancement on which to focus and around which to build a global celebration of science and humanity intended to promote a common bond among all the people of the Earth; and

Whereas February 12, 2017, is the anniversary of the birth of Charles Darwin in 1809 and would be an appropriate date to designate as ''Darwin Day'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of ''Darwin Day''; and

(2) recognizes Charles Darwin as a worthy symbol on which to celebrate the achievements of reason, science, and the advancement of human knowledge.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Daniel McCartney, a fellow in my office, be granted privileges of the floor for this session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 110–315, announces the appointment of the following individual to be a member of the National Academy Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity: Claude Pressnell of Tennessee.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—H.R. 590

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 590, the Advanced Nuclear Technology Development Act of 2017, be discharged from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 44 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 44) designating February 6 through 10, 2017, as ''National School Counseling Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 44) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 3, 2017, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AMERICAN HEART MONTH AND NATIONAL WEAR RED DAY

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 45 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 45) designating February 2017 as ''American Heart Month'' and February 3, 2017, as ''National Wear Red Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 45) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 3, 2017, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

SUPPORTING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 47 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 47) supporting the contributions of Catholic schools.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. 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. 47) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 3, 2017, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CONGRATULATING THE NEW ENGLAND PATRIOTS ON THEIR VICTORY IN SUPER BOWL LI

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 58, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 58) congratulating the New England Patriots on their victory in Super Bowl LI.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. 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. 58) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

PERMITTING USE OF THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate H. Con. Res. 18, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to 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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2017

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Monday, February 13; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Mnuchin nomination as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2017

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam 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 2:09 p.m., adjourned until Monday, February 13, 2017, at 12 noon.